REPORT

OF THE COMMITTEE APPOINTED BY THE ARCHBISHOPS OF CANTERBURY AND YORK TO CONSIDER THE FINDINGS OF THE LAUSANNE CONFERENCE ON

FAITH AND ORDER

PURSUANT TO RESOLUTION OF THE CHURCH ASSEMBLY PASSED AT THE SUMMER SESSION, 1928

TOGETHER WITH VARIOUS MEMORANDA

PRESENTED
FEBRUARY
1930

BX
6
W75
1927

GTU gstoa

...E COMMITTEE BY THE CHURCH ...
... BOARD OF THE CHURCH ASSEMBLY
... HOUSE, WESTMINSTER, S.W.1

Price Three Shillings

Church of England. Archbishops' committee to consider the findings of the Lausanne Conference on Faith and order.

REPORT

OF THE COMMITTEE APPOINTED BY THE ARCHBISHOPS OF CANTERBURY AND YORK TO CONSIDER THE FINDINGS OF THE LAUSANNE CONFERENCE ON

FAITH AND ORDER

PURSUANT TO RESOLUTION OF THE CHURCH ASSEMBLY PASSED AT THE SUMMER SESSION, 1928

TOGETHER WITH VARIOUS MEMORANDA

PRESENTED
FEBRUARY
1930

CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL of the PACIFIC LIBRARY

ISSUED FOR THE COMMITTEE BY THE PRESS AND PUBLICATIONS BOARD OF THE CHURCH ASSEMBLY
CHURCH HOUSE, WESTMINSTER, S.W.1

Price Three Shillings

CBDP

CONTENTS

REPORT

	PAGE
INTRODUCTORY	5
I. THE REPORTS OF THE LAUSANNE CONFERENCE .	9
II. UNITY IN THE MISSION FIELD	31
III. CONCLUSION	38
NOTES BY CERTAIN SIGNATORIES OF THE REPORT .	40

APPENDIX

1. The Character of the response to the Lausanne Reports. By the Very Rev. Dean Bate. .	47
2. The Number of the Sacraments. By the Rt. Rev. Bishop E. J. Palmer	51
3. The Validity of the Sacraments. By the Rt. Rev. Bishop Gore	55
4. The Meaning of Validity. By the Rt. Rev. Bishop E. J. Palmer	58
5. Meaning and Conditions of Validity. By the Rev. Canon Quick	62
6. Confirmation. By the Rev. Canon Quick . .	67
7. Reunion in the Mission Field. By the Rev. Canon Arthur W. Davies	71
8. The Proposed Scheme of Union in South India. By the Rt. Rev. Bishop E. J. Palmer . .	77
9. The Proposed Scheme of Union in South India: Comments on these Proposals by the Rt. Rev. Bishop Gore	100
10. Notes on the Christian Ministry and the Theory of Orders. By the Rt. Rev. the Bishop of Gloucester	112

CONTENTS

PAGE

11. Episcopacy in the Orthodox Church. By the Rev. W. A. Wigram, D.D. 124

12. Economic Intercommunion between the Anglican and the Orthodox Churches. By the Rev. Canon G. A. Douglas, Ph.D. . . . 129

13. Reunion with the Old Catholic Churches. By the Rev. C. B. Moss, B.D. 144

14. Memorandum sent by Certain Evangelical Clergy invited to interview the Committee . . 158

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE APPOINTED BY THE ARCHBISHOPS OF CANTERBURY AND YORK TO CONSIDER THE FINDINGS OF THE LAUSANNE CONFERENCE ON FAITH AND ORDER

To the Archbishops of Canterbury and York.

Your Graces,—

The Committee appointed by Your Graces to consider the Reports of the Lausanne Conference have the honour to report as follows :—

The membership of the Committee as originally constituted by Your Graces was :—

The Bishops of Gloucester* (*Chairman*), Winchester, Salisbury, Wakefield, Gibraltar, Fulham, Bishop Gore,* the Dean of Canterbury (Dr. Bell), the Very Rev. H. N. Bate,* the Venerable F. B. Macnutt,* Canons J. A. Douglas,* J. O. Hannay, O. C. Quick,* Tissington Tatlow* (*Honorary Secretary*), E. S. Woods,* W. A. Wigram, Garfield Williams, the Rev. W. K. Lowther Clarke, Lady Florence Cecil, Miss M. A. Codrington, Miss Ruth Rouse and Messrs. Albert Mitchell, A. G. Pite and Athelstan Riley.*

The Bishop of Wakefield shortly retired owing to his recent appointment to the Diocese of Wakefield. Dr. Lowther Clarke took part in most of our meetings but retired because of inability to attend the meeting when our report was finally drafted. The Dean of Canterbury retired on his appointment as Bishop of Chichester and Canon Garfield Williams on his appointment as Dean of Llandaff. These retirements were owing to the preoccupation of new work, but the Committee had the advantage of a considerable amount of help from Dr. Bell and Canon Williams before their retirement. Those who joined the Committee during the course of its work on the appointment of Your Graces were the Bishop of Guildford, Bishop E. J. Palmer, and the Rev. A. W. Davies.

The terms of reference of the Committee were contained

* Those whose names are marked with an asterisk were present at the Lausanne Conference, 1927.

in the resolution of the Church Assembly of July 6th, 1928, as follows :—

> "That the Archbishops of Canterbury and York be requested to appoint a committee (including in its membership some of the delegates to the conference) to consider the findings of the Conference on Faith and Order, to make them known throughout the Church of England, and to prepare memoranda with a view to submitting them to the Lambeth Conference in 1930."

The Committee held ten meetings at the Church House, Westminster, a meeting of three days at High Leigh, Hoddesdon, and a final meeting for revision. Between these meetings a considerable amount of work was done by members—working both individually and in groups—who furnished at the invitation of the Committee a number of memoranda for its guidance and consideration.

The Committee had interviews with the following persons on different aspects of its work :—

Dr. J. H. Oldham, Secretary of the International Missionary Council.

The Rev. H. C. Carter and Prof. C. H. Dodd, of the Congregationalists.

The Rev. Principal Maldwyn Hughes and the Rev. Professor Waterhouse, of the Wesleyan Methodists.

Bishop Tourian, of the Armenian Church.

Archbishop Germanos of Thyateira, of the Orthodox Church.

The Rev. Dr. Goudge, Regius Professor of Divinity, Oxford University, and the Rev. Dr. Darwell Stone, of Pusey House, Oxford.

The Rev. Prebendary Hinde, Vicar of Islington, the Rev. T. J. Pulvertaft, of the National Church League, the Rev. E. G. Bowring, of the Church Association, the Rev. G. T. Manley, of the Fellowship of Evangelical Churchmen, and the Rev. G. H. Harris, of the Anglican Evangelical Group Movement.

The Committee sought publicity for the Reports of the Lausanne Conference by sending through its Chairman a letter to the Diocesan Bishops, asking them to take steps to encourage the study of these Reports in their dioceses. For the purpose of this study the Committee issued through

the Press and Publications Board *Questions for the Use of Groups studying the Reports of the Lausanne Conference*, 1927. It also arranged for the writing of three pamphlets : *Early Attempts at Christian Union*, by Canon J. O. Hannay ; *Watersmeet : a description of the Proposed Union of Churches in South India*, by Bishop E. J. Palmer ; and *The Old Catholic Churches in Christendom*, by the Rev. C. B. Moss. Each writer is alone responsible for the contents of his pamphlet.

The Committee circulated several thousand copies of the *Reports of the World Conference on Faith and Order, Lausanne*, 1927.

The Chairman, on behalf of the Committee, also invited the help of the Girls' Diocesan Association, the Church of England Men's Society, the Mothers' Union, the Young Wives' Fellowship, the Church Lads' Brigade and the Student Christian Movement in making the Reports of the Conference known.

Our main duty and that to which we have devoted the greater part of our attention was " to consider the findings of the Lausanne Conference " and " to prepare memoranda with a view to submitting them to the Lambeth Conference in 1930."

In approaching our task we recall that the initial invitation addressed to all Christian Communions which confess our Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour, and asking them to come together for the consideration of those things in which we differ and those things in which we are at one, came from our sister Church in the United States. We recognise that the venture on which they then embarked has been fruitful beyond expectation : and at this point we would especially recall the labours of Robert Hallowell Gardiner and Charles Henry Brent, who from 1910 to the end of their lives devoted themselves unsparingly to this cause, and are remembered by every friend of the movement with deep affection and respect.

We propose to divide what we have to say as follows :—

I. An Examination of the Lausanne Reports.

II. Reunion in the Mission Field, with a description of the proposals for the creation of a South Indian United Church, and a united Christian Church in Persia.

And we add to our Report the following memoranda. These memoranda are appended for the sake of giving information as to facts and doctrines, and the opinions held by different sections of the Church. The Committee is not in any way responsible for the opinions expressed.

MEMORANDA.

1. The character of the response to the Lausanne Reports.
   By the Very Rev. Dean Bate.
2. The Number of the Sacraments.
   By the Rt. Rev. Bishop E. J. Palmer.
3. The Validity of the Sacraments.
   By the Rt. Rev. Bishop Gore.
4. The Meaning of Validity.
   By the Rt. Rev. Bishop E. J. Palmer.
5. Meaning and Conditions of Validity.
   By the Rev. Canon Quick.
6. Confirmation.
   By the Rev. Canon Quick.
7. Reunion in the Mission Field.
   By the Rev. Canon Arthur W. Davies, Secretary of the Missionary Council.
8. The Proposed Scheme of Union in South India.
   By the Rt. Rev. Bishop E. J. Palmer.
9. The Proposed Scheme of Union in South India. Comments on these Proposals.
   By the Rt. Rev. Bishop Gore.
10. Notes on the Christian Ministry and the Theory of Orders.
    By the Rt. Rev. the Bishop of Gloucester.
11. Episcopacy in the Orthodox Church.
    By the Rev. Dr. Wigram.
12. Economic Intercommunion between the Anglican and the Orthodox Churches.
    By the Rev. Canon Douglas.
13. Reunion with the Old Catholic Churches.
    By the Rev. C. B. Moss, B.D.
14. Memorandum sent by certain Evangelical Clergy invited to interview the Committee.

I. THE REPORTS OF THE LAUSANNE CONFERENCE.

In considering the Lausanne Reports it seemed to us that the most useful purpose that we could fulfil would be to compare them with the Appeal of the Lambeth Conference, 1920, and to consider how far they represent a satisfactory basis for Christian Reunion from the Anglican point of view.

The " Appeal to all Christian people " began with the acknowledgment that " all those who believe in our Lord Jesus Christ, and have been baptised into the Name of the Holy Trinity, share with us membership in the Universal Church of Christ, which is His Body." This acknowledgment is followed by a statement of what is implied by Christian unity :—

" We believe that God wills fellowship. By God's own act this fellowship was made in and through Jesus Christ, and its life is in His Spirit. We believe that it is God's purpose to manifest this fellowship, as far as this world is concerned, in an outward visible and united society, holding one faith, having its own recognised officers, using God-given means of grace, and inspiring all its members to the worldwide service of the Kingdom of God. This is what we mean by the Catholic Church."

After discussing the need for Christian unity at the present time and outlining the vision of a Church which should be loyal to Catholic Truth and Unity while " within this unity Christian Communions now separated from one another would retain much that has long been distinctive in their methods of worship and service," the Appeal proceeds as follows :—

" We believe that the visible unity of the Church will be found to involve the whole-hearted acceptance of :—

" The Holy Scriptures, as the record of God's revelation of Himself to man, and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith ; and the Creed commonly called Nicene, as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith, and either it or the Apostles Creed as the Baptismal Confession of belief :

"The Divinely instituted Sacraments of Baptism and the Holy Communion, as expressing for all the corporate life of the whole fellowship in and with Christ:

"A ministry acknowledged by every part of the Church as possessing not only the inward call of the Spirit, but also the Commission of Christ and the authority of the whole body."

And then it adds:—

"May we not reasonably claim that the Episcopate is the one means of providing such a ministry?"

This statement contains the well-known Lambeth Quadrilateral, as it has been called—that is, the proposal that the basis of reunion should be the acceptance of the Scriptures, the Creeds, the two Sacraments and Episcopacy. From this position the Lambeth Conference has never receded, although the method of statement in the Conference of 1920 was somewhat changed.

Fundamentally the question that we have to ask is to what extent the Lausanne Reports agree with these conditions. Although there are differences in expression and in detail, and although, as is natural if we consider the composition of the Lausanne Conference, its statements are often more tentative and less confident, there is a remarkable agreement between its Reports and the Lambeth Appeal. That agreement seems to us a significant fact, and should make the attitude of the Church of England towards the Lausanne Reports sympathetic.

Besides the Report of the Lambeth Conference and the Appeal to all Christian people, we have examined the Lausanne Reports in the light afforded by the report on Church Unity issued by the Joint Conferences held at Lambeth Palace 1921–25 between representatives of the Church of England and the Free Churches. These reports have not any authority except that given by the names of those who signed them, but they were an important attempt to find a common basis of agreement on the difficult subjects of the Church, the Ministry and the Creeds, and great significance must lie in the fact that in some cases the Reports of the

Lausanne Conference reproduce almost verbally the statements agreed to at those Conferences.

This also seems to suggest that it is now possible to arrive at a common mind on some subjects which have been in the past serious causes of division, and increases (as it seems to us) the duty of the Anglican Church to receive with thankfulness and to study with sympathy the Reports of the Lausanne Conference.

It remains to state the significance which is to be ascribed to the agreement which was arrived at Lausanne.

The Conference represented a larger variety of bodies of Christians than had conferred on matters of faith for many centuries, but it must not be forgotten that at least half of Christendom, that is to say, the Churches of the Roman Obedience, though invited, was unrepresented at the Conference, and this fact qualifies the sense in which the Reports can be said to testify to an agreement of Christendom. It is also important to observe that the Reports themselves vary in the measure of agreement they imply.

The Report opens with a preamble which was drawn up by the Chairman, Bishop Brent, and adopted unanimously by the whole Conference. The first Report, which is " The Call to Unity," was also adopted unanimously. The next five Reports, " The Church's Message to the World—the Gospel," " The Nature of the Church," " The Church's Common Confession of Faith," " The Ministry of the Church," and " The Sacraments," were received by the Conference *nem. con.*

What this implies is stated in the preamble. Each subject on the agenda was first discussed in plenary session. It was then committed to one of the sections of more than 100 members each, into which the whole Conference was divided. The Report, after full discussion in sub-sections, was finally drawn up and adopted unanimously or by a large majority vote by the section to which it had been committed. It was twice presented for further discussion to a plenary session of the Conference, when it was referred to the Churches in its present form.

This implies not that the Reports represented the absolute agreement of the Conference. It accepted them as a statement of the points on which a measure of agreement had

been attained, as suggesting the lines on which further agreement and revision might be possible, and as a statement of the points on which at present there was disagreement. They were intended to form the basis of further discussion.

Some exception must be made to this statement as regards Report II—on "The Gospel." It may be considered certain that this represented a much greater measure of agreement than those which followed. The Declaration made by Archbishop Germanos on behalf of the Eastern Orthodox delegates states :—"The Report on the message of the Church, since it is drafted on the basis of the teaching of the Holy Scripture, is in accordance with the Orthodox conception, and can be accepted by us." It continues that the Orthodox proposed to act otherwise with regard to the remaining Reports, to which they considered themselves "bound to refrain from agreeing," and this they did, although they took part in the discussions, both in plenary session and in Committee. It is clear that so far as their open Declaration goes, the representatives of the Orthodox Church were not prepared to depart from strict adherence to their own position in all matters which regard the Church, the Creed, the Ministry and the Sacraments, but that they were prepared to accept the statement of the content of the Gospel. The same may, we think, be said of the other sections of the Conference, and it is correct to say that Report II was accepted unanimously.

There remains Report VII. This Report has not the authority of the Conference. The original Report was "referred to the Drafting Committee for consideration," but the Report, when received (as appears from the debate), was not likely to command the unanimous approval of the Conference, and it was referred to the Continuation Committee, and a special committee was appointed to consider the situation. This special committee revised the Report, especially "by following more consistently the precedent set in earlier Reports of stating alternative positions when there was difference of view." This Report then has only the authority of a special committee and of the Business Committee by whose authority it was sent forth. It may, however, be taken as a fairly correct view of the different lines of thought that prevailed in the Conference.

As it was here more than anywhere else that a tendency to cleavage revealed itself in the Conference, it may be useful to mention the two points particularly on which there was a difference of opinion, which is reflected in the Report. They were :—

(1) That while one section of the Conference was aiming at an organic union, the other section would have been content with some form of federation, at any rate as a first step and as a result ;

(2) While one section would look upon Intercommunion as the first step towards unity, and was, in fact, much disappointed that the Conference did not end with a corporate Communion, there was another section which would hold no less strongly that Intercommunion must be regarded as the sign of completed unity.

The seventh Report then does not come with the authority of the Conference as a whole, but it was drafted with the purpose of expressing the different opinions that prevailed in it.

1. The Call to Unity.

The first Report does not demand much discussion. It may be looked upon as the most representative response possible at present to the Appeal of the Lambeth Conference.

" God wills unity. Our presence in this Conference bears testimony to our desire to bend our wills to His. However we may justify the beginnings of disunion, we lament its continuance and henceforth must labour, in penitence and faith, to build up our broken walls."

The particular point that it adds to what was put forth at Lambeth is the insistence on the demand for unity from the Mission Field.

" Our Missions count that as a necessity which we are inclined to look on as a luxury. Already the mission field is impatiently revolting from the divisions of the Western Church to make bold adventure for unity in its own right."

It may be noted that nothing impressed the Conference more than addresses which were delivered by Indian and Chinese representatives of the young Churches in their countries, putting the demand for Christian unity which came from those Churches. This marks a new situation.

While at home the demand for organic unity comes, in the main, from leaders of Christian thought and work, the demand in the mission field comes from the general body of the people who are determined to unite.

2. The Church's Message to the World—the Gospel.

The second Report, that on the Gospel, states in informal language the fundamental truths of Christianity, sometimes described as the Gospel, sometimes as the Catholic Faith. It expresses the significance of the three fundamental doctrines of Christianity, the Incarnation, the Atonement and the Trinity.

" In the fulness of time the eternal Word of God became incarnate, and was made man, Jesus Christ, the Son of God and the Son of Man, full of grace and truth."

" Through His life and teaching, His call to repentance, His proclamation of the coming of the Kingdom of God and of Judgment, His suffering and death, His resurrection and exaltation to the right hand of the Father, and by the mission of the Holy Spirit He has brought to us forgiveness of sins and has revealed the fulness of the living God, and His boundless love towards us."

This message of redemption is the ground of the new life in Christ.

" By the appeal of that love, shown in its completeness on the Cross, He summons us to the new life of faith, self-sacrifice, and devotion to His service and the service of men."

This gospel is " the gift of a new world from God to this old world of sin and death." It " is the prophetic call to sinful man to turn to God, the joyful tidings of justification and of sanctification to those who believe in Christ." It " is the sure source of power for social regeneration." It " is also a gracious invitation to the non-Christian world, East and West, to enter into the joy of the living Lord."

The point of significance to note about this statement is that it was accepted with real unanimity by the Conference. Since then it has been accepted by the Jerusalem Missionary Conference of 1928 as its expression of the message of Christianity, and it has received general acceptance as an adequate statement of the meaning of Christianity.

We feel that we are justified in accepting this Report as

wholly consistent with the teaching of the Anglican Communion and as witnessing to a real and remarkable agreement on the message of Christianity. As such it indicates the foundation for the rebuilding of Christian unity.

3. The Nature of the Church.

It is difficult to contemplate any successful reunion which will not involve the attainment by the Churches concerned of some common view of the nature of the Church. The way will be prepared for this by a shifting of the emphasis from matters of difference to matters of agreement.

Lausanne Report III is of real value because both its matter and its spirit indicate this shifting of emphasis, and also because it states some vital points of agreement which show definite movement towards the necessary common view of the nature of the Church. It is not so valuable in elucidating the points of disagreement.

The Report indicates general agreement on the following points :—

1. The reality of the Church as a divinely-constituted Society of believers in Christ, of which Christ is the Head and the Holy Spirit the life.

2. The vocation of the Church as witness to the Gospel and as the divinely-appointed instrument for the salvation and sanctification of mankind.

3. The unity of the Church as necessary both to its being, as expressed by the words One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic : and to the manifestation of its life to the world.

4. The common possession by the Church of certain marks and characteristics :—

(*a*) Possession and use of Holy Scripture.
(*b*) Faith in God as He is incarnate and revealed in Christ.
(*c*) Missionary Vocation.
(*d*) Observance and use of Sacraments.
(*e*) Possession of a Ministry.
(*f*) Fellowship in Devotion and Service.

All these points are common ground between the Report and the Church of England, and the agreement arrived at with regard to them is encouraging.

The Report, however, makes it evident that there was deep-seated disagreement at the Conference as to the degree in which these elements of unity are present in and are acceptable as a whole to the existing churches. The "*Notes*" reveal the differences which emerged upon such important points as the following :—

1. The relative authority of tradition and individual experience as interpreting the Word of God.
2. The relation of the visible to the invisible aspect of the Church.
3. The authority of the visible order in the Church.
4. The necessity of any single type of order in the Church.
5. The exclusive right of any Church to claim that it conforms to the true type.
6. The witness of the Church's experience to the necessity of any particular form of ministry.
7. The origin and significance of existing divisions.

The language employed in the Report is often vague. We think that there is serious need among Christians generally of clear thinking and definiteness of expression, especially upon the following matters :—

1. How far the unity of the Church (acknowledged to be necessary) must needs limit or can permit variation of order in its several parts. (This question is left entirely unanswered in this Report.)
2. How far the various views held with regard to the authority of Holy Scripture, of tradition, and of individual experience, respectively, are capable of reconciliation. Is such a reconciliation possible through a simple synthesis of the views now held, or only if some of these undergo substantial modifications ?
3. How far the conception of the Invisible Church held by some Churches invalidates or neutralises their belief in the Visible Church.
4. Finally, there is the vital question : Whether Christ did, in fact, found or refound one visible and recognisable society, membership in which was intended to be inseparable from membership in Christ. No answer to this question is returned in the Report.

The members of the Conference who received the Report differed widely in regard to the question: What is the Church on earth? For instance, one typical answer given by some would have been "The whole number of believers in Christ"; others, while recognising that all baptised persons are in some sense members of the Church, hold that the Church in the sense of an organised body on earth consists of those Communions which retain the apostolic succession and hold to the Creeds as authoritative confessions of the faith, and to the sacramental system; others, while agreeing that the Church includes all baptised persons, would hold and would not go further than the definition of Article XIX, that "The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in the which the pure Word of God is preached, and the Sacraments be duly ministered according to Christ's ordinance in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same."

Finally, we would point out that the terms "the Church" and "the branches of the Church" are used in the Report to cover conflicting conceptions. Much of the vagueness of the Report would appear to be due to this ambiguity, and in our judgment real progress towards the general union of the Churches will not be made until some conclusion is reached as to what constitutes the Catholic Church and the particular Churches into which it is divided.

These are crucial questions which the Report raises and it appears that further progress towards agreement upon the Nature of the Church can only be made if enquiry is pursued along these lines.

4. The Church's Common Confession of Faith,

I.

In considering "the Report of Section IV," we rejoice to find "the Ecumenical Creed, commonly called the Nicene, and the Apostles Creed" accepted as witnessing to and safeguarding the common scriptural Faith. These creeds are propounded in the Prayer Book to be both believed and recited as veritable statements of the Church's faith, both as regards matters of fact and matters of doctrine; but we must not suppose that it was in this full sense that all the members of the Conference gave their adherence to

them. Nevertheless, we can rejoice at this renewed recognition of the Creeds as the standard expression of the common faith.

Moreover, we can cordially welcome the "solemn and unanimous testimony that no external or written standards can suffice without an inward and personal experience of union with God in Christ." Certainly no adhesion to written formulae can make a man a good Christian. But the individual self-surrender and experience which is of the essence of the Christian life depends upon that objective revelation of God in Christ which it is the function of the Creeds to state and protect.

2.

On the notes of difference we would add two remarks. First, on the subject of the *filioque* clause in the Nicene Creed, we would express a hope that at any general reunion Christendom would, as an act of reparation, agree to affirm the original form of the Creed settled at Chalcedon, as the official creed of the Catholic Church then reunited, provided that the Churches which desire to retain the *filioque* should be at liberty so to do with the goodwill of the whole reunited Church.

On the second note the position of the English Church is clearly that the Creeds are subordinated to the Holy Scriptures; and it does not admit any tradition to the level or standard of the Scriptures, or impose on its members any article of belief which is not confirmed in Holy Scripture (see Article VI).

5. The Ministry of the Church.

This Report records that the Lausanne Conference was in substantial accord upon five propositions, in which the Ministry was recognised as a gift of God through Christ to the Church, essential to the Church's being and well-being, authorised and made effective through the Spirit; as being entrusted with functions of service, preaching, sacramental ministration, government and discipline; and as being perpetuated through the ordination (by prayer and the laying on of hands) of men called by the Spirit and accepted by the Church.

Further, it recognises that the obstacles to intercommunion which arise from differences as to the Ministry are most serious, especially in the Mission Field, and affirms the conviction that the provision of a Ministry acknowledged in every part of the Church* as possessing the sanction of the whole Church is an urgent need.

The Report refers to the Churches for further study :—

(*a*) The main differences as to the nature, transmission and functions of the Ministry by which Christendom in the East and West is now divided ;

(*b*) The proposals which have been made in recent years for the reconciliation of these differences ; and

(*c*) Certain specific elements in these proposals, relating to the concessions which they would or would not involve.

We desire to submit certain considerations upon the substance of the Report and the problems which it indicates ; but first of all we would express our deep gratitude for the main affirmations which it contains. The recognition of the Ministry as divinely given and essential to the Church, and of Ordination through prayer and the laying on of hands, is particularly welcome as clearing the way towards a mutual understanding. Further, we desire to emphasise and endorse what the Conference says as to the urgency of the need for a Ministry possessing the widest possible authorisation. We feel, indeed, that this necessity is rapidly becoming more urgent. As at Lausanne, so at Jerusalem in 1928, it dominated the minds of many of those who are working in the mission field and in the younger Churches : indeed, it was clearly indicated at Jerusalem that the process of reunion among some of the younger Churches would in any case go forward. The demand for remedial action becomes more and more insistent. Accordingly we submit that the consideration

* These words, of course, involve acknowledgment by the Roman Catholic and by the Eastern Orthodox Churches, and force us to remember how far off we are, in face of the present mind of the different communions of Christendom, from surmounting the obstacles to the attainment of this ideal. The Orthodox representatives at Lausanne found it necessary to make a separate statement of their principles on this subject, and to refrain from endorsing the general Report. We are confident, however, that they would not dissent either from the five propositions referred to above, or from the affirmation referred to in this paragraph.

of the principles which should determine the Church's action in this matter is a pressing duty.

The Report speaks of various forms of ministry as having grown up within the divided communions of Christendom, "according to the circumstances of the several communions and their beliefs as to the mind of Christ and the guidance of the New Testament."* As an approach to present problems this statement seems to us inadequate. For some 1,500 years one main type of ministerial order persisted within the Church as a whole, and in the ancient historic Churches it still persists. But, side by side with it, since the sixteenth century, in a multitude of Christian communions severed from the main stream of historic tradition various modes of ministry believed to be in accordance with the guidance of the New Testament have come into being. The main motive which prompted these new beginnings in Church order was a desire to return from the complexity and corruption of the mediæval Church to the simplicity of a primitive and evangelical pattern. For most of those, at the time of their creation, it was claimed that they had an inherent right, in virtue of their scriptural character, to supersede the traditional and continuous ministry of the Church. The historic Churches on their side have for the most part repudiated the ministries of the new mode.

Those Churches which have retained the traditional principles of order, the Church of England among them, now find themselves in the presence of a multitude of other communions which have dissociated themselves from tradition, and possess a Ministry of word and sacrament differing in origin, form and function from theirs.

In so far, then, as the problem of reunion, or rather that part of the problem which was considered at Lausanne, is dependent upon that of the ministry—*i.e.*, upon a ministry possessing the widest possible authorisation, it may be stated thus :—

> In what way, if in any, is it possible for the ministerial life and order of the traditional type to effect a recon-

* This paragraph of the Lausanne Report is taken verbally from the Report of the Joint Conference at Lambeth in May, 1922 (Bell, Documents, pp. 143 f).

ciliation with the life and order which are based, not on tradition, but upon conscious attempts to recreate the Church upon the model of the New Testament ?

We believe that such a reconciliation, even though it would only provide a partial resolution of existing discords, is deeply to be desired. We have considered the suggestions leading in this direction which are mentioned in the Lausanne Report, and also the divergences of opinion recorded in its appended Notes, and offer the following observations upon them :—

1. We note it is suggested that the Episcopate must have its " appropriate place in the life of a reunited Church." It is in our judgment " appropriate " that the Bishop should be regarded as the rightful minister of ordination and of confirmation, and as the proper guardian of truth, discipline and administrative order within the area of his jurisdiction. We agree that " the Council of Presbyters and the Congregation of the faithful must also have their appropriate place." That the Bishop, though charged with the direct responsibility of oversight, should act as chief over a group of presbyters with whom he takes counsel, and that each local congregation should be recognised as quasi-personal, possessing rights of its own as well as duties to a larger whole, are principles to which the Church of England is now giving increasingly effective recognition. We recognise further (with the Report) that the fullest possible use should be made of the services of the laity in teaching, in deliberation, and in all that ministers to the common life.

2. The suggestions to which we have referred involve a general acquiescence in the rule of episcopal ordination for the Church of the future. To that acquiescence certain negative conditions are attached. " It is essential," we read, " that it should not be interpreted (*a*) to imply the acceptance of any one particular theory of the origin, character or function of any office in the Church, or (*b*) to involve the acceptance of any adverse judgment on the validity of ordination in those branches of the Church universal that believe themselves to have retained valid and apostolic Orders under other forms of ordination ; or (*c*) as disowning or discrediting a past or

present ministry of the Word and Sacrament which has been used and blessed by the Spirit of God."

On the first of these conditions we would make three observations :—

i. It was generally agreed at Lausanne that " the Ministry is the gift of God through Christ to His Church, and is essential to the being and well-being of the Church." We regard this agreement as fundamentally important, as governing all that follows it, and as constituting a broad ground of principle upon which the question of Episcopacy should be approached. It is clearly concerned with the origin and character of the Ministry as a whole, and the " conditions " now before us could not properly be interpreted in such a way as to infringe it. Further,

ii. In actual practice, as apart from theories of origin, the working of the episcopal principle would in fact require the acceptance of a delimitation of the functions, and therefore of the character, of every essential ministerial office.

iii. It is also to be noted that there exist at present among members of the Anglican Church two theories of the episcopate ; one which regards it as of the *esse* of the Church, another which regards it as at most only of the *bene esse*. If the reunited Church is to correspond to the requirement (*a*) stated above, neither of these theories must be officially either affirmed or denied.

We should, indeed, consider it unwise to demand or expect as a term of communion, the acceptance of any one theory of the origins of the Ministry. The Anglican Ordinal, we observe, confines itself to a general statement as to the primitive character of the three orders and the conditions requisite for the exercise of the ministerial functions in the Church of England. We know that the last word has not yet been spoken upon the early history of Church order, and we are content to leave many of its problems as proper material for scientific study. But we are convinced that a general return to traditional usage in this matter is in fact a necessity of reunion, and we should not be justified in holding this conviction ourselves unless we were able to declare to others, whatever degree of assent we may expect from them, that in our judgment it is no mere technicality of

procedure but rests upon a strong foundation of reason and history.

We do, in fact, so judge. The principle of the orderly continuance of ministerial authority is plainly apostolic. Whatever varieties of Church order may be traceable in the age succeeding the Apostles, the convergent tendency towards the establishment of the monarchical Episcopate was manifested everywhere in that period ; nor did the early Church evolve or recognise in the sphere of order any other principle of coherence or guarantee of its own continuity. As main factors in its life, the Rule of Faith, the Canon of Scripture and the Episcopate stand in this respect side by side.

If, at any time before the sixteenth century, the question had arisen : " What ministry is acknowledged in every part of the Church as having the sanction of the whole Church ? " the answer would without doubt have been a Ministry conferred by episcopal ordination. We are sure that our own Church will never abandon this principle. We cannot therefore imagine that a ministry universally recognised could come into being otherwise than on the basis of a general return to continuity in this respect.

We have great hopes that other Churches which are now without Bishops may come to take this view, but, if they do, they will almost certainly demand the consideration of the question whether there is not a place, in God's plan for His Church, for ministries which are not constituted by episcopal ordination. Some would answer this in the negative. Others, however, believe that it can be answered in the affirmative without abandoning the claim of the episcopal ministry to be the normal and permanently necessary ministry of the Church. In any case the question will be raised in any proposal for union with non-episcopal Churches.

(3) The conditions numbered (*b*) and (*c*) above call for careful consideration. Plain justice, no less than charity, demands that we should acknowledge ungrudgingly the vitality, the converting power, and the heroism in missionary enterprise which abound in the ministries of non-episcopal communions. To deny their reality as ministries within the divided life of Christendom would be gravely perilous. We recall what was said by the Church of England representatives on the Joint Conference at Lambeth in July, 1923, that

" ministries which imply a sincere intention to preach Christ's word and administer the Sacrament as Christ has ordained, and to which authority so to do has been solemnly given by the Church concerned, are real ministries of Christ's Word and Sacraments in the Universal Church."

But we also recall the words which follow these, that " ministries even when so regarded, may be in varying degrees irregular or defective." Some of us would be of opinion that all ministries, in so far as they do not possess the endorsement of the whole of Christendom, are necessarily incomplete ; and all of us hold that non-episcopal ministries stand in need of supplement and regularisation. We are agreed that no movement toward such regularisation can hope (or deserve) to make progress if it involves repudiation by any minister of his ministry as invalid ; and at the same time we desire to make it possible for existing irregularities to be remedied by the restoration, however gradual, of a factor of regularity which the non-episcopal communions have abandoned.

We believe that such a process will be greatly facilitated if in all discussions and negotiations an outlook towards the future is steadily maintained. The acceptance of episcopacy in any form will call for a real sacrifice, which should be met on our side with equal generosity. If we can show that our minds are turned towards the Church that is to be and that we desire to do no injustice to the past or the present, but only to co-operate in building a more coherent structure for the future, we may hope frankly to fulfil the conditions under discussion.

The Lausanne Report makes no allusion to suggestions involving reordination. The prospects in that direction are not sufficiently encouraging to invite any present re-opening of the question.

On two points we feel that further enquiry and interchange of views is to be desired :—

1. We observe, and our conversations as a Committee with Free Churchmen have shown us, that there are, in non-episcopal bodies, two prevalent views as to the nature and significance of Ordination. One of these approximates more or less closely to that with which we are familiar ; and

it was adopted by the Joint Conference at Lambeth in May, 1922, which agreed to say that in Ordination, together with the commission to minister, " Divine grace is given through the Holy Spirit in response to prayer and faith for the fulfilment of the charge so committed." But, side by side with this, an opinion is very widely current that Ordination is never more than the corporate recognition and commissioning of persons whom the inward call of Christ has already made to be ministers. It would be difficult for any communion committed to this latter view to accept any form of ordination or consecration which follows ancient precedent ; and on the other hand we cannot suppose that the ordinal of a reuniting Church would contain merely forms of recognition. We therefore think that the history and authority of the two views mentioned should be the subject of further study and discussion.

(2) Although the subject of Confirmation properly belongs to Report VI, it is also closely related to Report V : for a ministry acknowledged in every part of the Church could not function as an instrument of unity apart from a laity similarly acknowledged as possessing the full status of Church membership. The question therefore arises whether Confirmation is to be regarded as essential to full Church membership, and if so, in what precise manner. We therefore submit that enquiry into the whole subject of Confirmation as a condition of communion should now be pressed forward *pari passu* with the further study of the problems of the Ministry.

6. The Sacraments

The Report of the Lausanne Conference on the Sacraments does not contain anything which is opposed to the principles of the Church of England except that, if a similar report were drawn up on behalf of the Church of England, some things noted below would be expressed differently, and some things which in the Lausanne Report find their places amongst divergent views would be placed amongst those about which there is no reasonable dispute. It is also possible to carry further the definition and elucidation of divergent views than has been done in the Report, a point

in which it comes far behind the other Reports of the Conference.

Nor again is the Report inconsistent with anything said in the Lambeth Appeal. Very little was said in the Reports of the Joint Conference with regard to the Sacraments. The Lausanne Report is not inconsistent with anything said by that Conference except in one point, which is noted below. We now proceed to deal with the paragraphs of the Report.

In paragraph 2 " the Christian world " is said to " give evidence of an increasing sense of the significance and value of sacraments." There is evidence of this in the increased frequency of communion in the Roman and Orthodox Churches, as also among ourselves. It should be noted also that in other circles the fact referred to is partly due to a new sense of the " sacramental aspect of all life," though this in some quarters apparently has the opposite effect of decreasing the importance attached to the Sacraments of the Christian religion.

In paragraph 5 we would observe that the number of the sacraments is a question which must be considered separately from that of their valid administration. A detailed consideration of the number of the Sacraments and the meaning of the word will be found in Appendix 2.

We proceed here to consider the attitude which the Church of England would adopt in any negotiations concerning union with other Churches with regard to the seven ordinances which the Orthodox and the Roman Church call Sacraments. We submit that the Church of England is concerned to maintain that these ordinances are all means of grace to those who resort to them with right dispositions, and our Church has provided forms for them at the Reformation and subsequent revisions of the Prayer Book, except that since the book of 1549 no form for the Unction of the Sick has been provided, though that ceremony is not forbidden. We could not approve of any Church claiming a right to forbid the use of any of these seven ordinances, or consent to join in any Church union wherein it was proposed to forbid the use of any of them. We do, however, draw the distinction made in the Catechism and Articles of the Church of England between those two, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord, which were ordained by Christ Himself, and the others. In regard to

this distinction it is obvious that neither Matrimony, nor Orders, nor Unction, are generally necessary to salvation. With regard to Penance, it is certainly generally necessary to salvation that men should confess their sins with true contrition, but it is not the doctrine of the Church of England that even grave sins committed after Baptism must be confessed either openly or privately to a Priest in order to receive God's pardon and absolution. It is, however, the duty of the Church to provide means for bringing to the contrite sinner who needs it the authoritative message of Absolution upon his confession, whether privately before a Priest or openly in the congregation. The rule of the Church of England which lays down that a person shall not be admitted to Holy Communion unless he has been confirmed or is ready and desirous to be confirmed indicates that the Church of England regards Confirmation as obligatory on all its members who have the opportunity of receiving it, and, though not itself "generally necessary to salvation," yet as being the door of access to one of the Sacraments which it has declared to be so. A detailed treatment of various views held on Confirmation will be found in Appendix 6.

If it be agreed that, in any reunited Church of the future, none of these ordinances must be forbidden, there remains the question to what extent should the terms of union include provision for their due observance. The object to be aimed at is that the Church, by its central authority, should provide them for all who ought to avail themselves of the provision. All would say this about Baptism, the Lord's Supper, and Holy Orders; and we would add Confirmation and Absolution.

In paragraph 5 mention is made of the question of validity. It is a difficult question which we do not propose to treat of here. We would refer our readers to the three Memoranda which are in the Appendix. See pages 55-66.

In paragraph 6 the first sentence is acceptable to the Church of England if it means that persons so baptised are baptised into the one holy catholic Church and not into any particular church. But the paragraph is defective in at least two points of great importance. The Church of England holds that Baptism is the divinely appointed door of admission into the visible Church of Christ, and also that

persons baptised in the manner described in the paragraph are regenerate. We should submit that it is impossible with due regard to the authority of scripture or Catholic teaching to deny either of these propositions. We also note that the first of them was affirmed by the Joint Conference at Lambeth, 1922, Report I, 7 (Bell, p. 35).

On paragraph 7, we must remark that the Church of England would desiderate the affirmation of some things and the proper definition of a good many more which are relegated to the very vague paragraph 8 of the Report. The latter task we do not propose to undertake as it requires the collaboration of members of other Churches.

We think that the discussion of form and matter of the Sacraments could be carried further than has been done with distinct hope of agreement. The form and matter of Baptism are stated in paragraph 5 in a way on which the Churches could agree. The matter of the Lord's Supper is Bread and Wine, and there would probably be agreement that, as regards form, it is necessary that the Lord's words at the institution should be used, as was assumed in the Lambeth Quadrilateral, 1888.

The Report missed a great opportunity in one other respect. It might have stated the mediating view between the exaggerations connected with the watchwords "ex opere operato" and "sola fide.' We are saved by grace and we are saved through faith. In the Sacraments grace and faith meet. God's activity is real and complete. He does all His part in bringing to men the grace which the particular Sacrament is meant to convey. Whether they accept it or not, He has done His part according to His promises or His abiding intention of benignity, and in answer to the prayers of the Church. But this action of God is unfruitful for any person who does not accept the grace offered in the Sacrament with faith. The two parties to the ancient controversy were both attempting to safeguard truths which might now be generally acknowledged ; one that the grace offered in the Sacrament is inefficacious to individuals who have not faith, the other that the faith of the individual does not create the grace of the Sacrament, but that God offers it actually there and then, and the individual accepts it : thus God's will in the Sacrament has fruition.

7. The Unity of Christendom and the Relation Thereto of Existing Churches.

1. It seems certain to us that the desire for corporate unity is to be found amongst Christians of all communions. That His disciples should be one is recognised as the will of the Master. It is also evident that the work of evangelizing the world and influencing for righteousness societies nominally Christian is hindered by our divisions. The conferences at Stockholm, Lausanne and Jerusalem have shown the depth of this feeling. But widely diffused as the desire for unity is, much remains to be done before it can become practically operative on any large scale. In particular it has not yet permeated the rank and file of our Churches at home. Whilst sections show enthusiasm, many clergy and laity exhibit little reflection of the ideals of their leaders, and even when interest in problems of reunion is shown and enthusiastic partisanship is exhibited, it is frequently unrelated to even the most cursory first-hand study of the literature of the subject and the facts of particular proposals.

We suggest that efforts should be made to promote this desire, and since the minds of the young are more easily moved to great ends than those of the old, special attention should be given to them in Universities and Colleges and through all organisations which can be used for such a purpose. We would call special attention to theological colleges and the opportunities they present for action in this direction.

2. The conditions at present and the trend of thought make us hopeful of good results from such efforts. There is a general recognition of the value of unity and co-operation in international affairs. The rapid disappearance of the old spirit of sectarian bitterness makes the way to Christian unity easier. The lines that divide us are deep and strongly marked, but it seems certain now that if the work of drawing them had to be done in our day by men of our mentality, it would not have been done at all. Would the mission of a 20th-century John Wesley, for instance, result in a fresh schism?

If then, we should not now draw the lines of separation, is it not possible for us to obliterate them?

3. We have considered the steps that have been taken in the past towards the promotion of intercommunion with the

Orthodox Church of the East, the Old Catholics, the Swedish, the Armenian, Coptic, Syrian Orthodox, and Assyrian Churches. We believe that in some cases the stage has been reached when such efforts should be brought to fruition. Commissions might be appointed to this end.

4. Owing to much misunderstanding of the Anglican position we should welcome an authoritative statement of the sense in which the articles of the Lambeth Quadrilateral are to be understood.

(*a*) The Holy Scripture.
(*b*) The Creeds.
(*c*) Sacraments.
(*d*) Historic Episcopate.

Such a statement should be short, and if translated into several languages would be of great value to those Anglicans who are working amongst the rank and file of other Churches in the cause of reunion. We press especially for an explanation of the term "Historic Episcopate." Until this is made clear there must be hesitation on the road to reunion on the part of bodies outside the Anglican Church.

It is reasonable to ask what is meant by the phrase.

5. With regard to the proposals for general intercommunion between Christian bodies at present divided, the interchange of pulpits and the common conduct of united services, we do not at the present time recommend any extension of the rules and principles laid down by the Lambeth Conference, 1920 (Resolution 12), and endorsed by the Convocations.

On the question of united Communion Services we feel that they should mark the completion of a scheme of reunion and not previous stages. By united Communion Services we mean services organised jointly by Anglicans and authorities of other Churches with which we are not at present in communion.

On the subject of the admission of baptised persons who are non-Anglicans to Communion in Anglican Churches in special circumstances, though the Committee was not unanimous, a strong desire was expressed that it should be allowed under proper regulation and authority, and we hope that attention will be given to this question by the Lambeth Conference.

6. We are of opinion that the visits of prominent English Churchmen to foreign churches and universities, the giving of lectures on the Anglican position and such efforts, have done good in the past by clearing up misunderstandings and may be expected to do good in the future. But such visits should not be spasmodic, individual efforts. They should be undertaken with the consent of the Archbishops and with the knowledge of the Anglican Bishop of the jurisdiction.

II. UNITY IN THE MISSION FIELD.

In an earlier portion of this Report we have drawn attention to the important position created by the great and growing desire for Christian Union among the young churches in the Mission Field. We have had a considerable amount of evidence put before us by Canon Garfield Williams and Dr. Oldham, and the following notes are based on their evidence. The general situation as presented to us is that as the young churches increase in size and grow in consciousness they often show an increasing desire to be freed from the separations and divisions which they have inherited from the older Christian countries, and which have no meaning at all for them. To them the fundamental fact is that they are Christians and have ceased to share in the old non-Christian life of the country. The fact of the new life overpowers the points of difference which do not appear to them to be of any weight. This desire for unity and indifference to the old causes of division is strengthened by the growth of many national aims. It is the desire in many countries—but to a different degree in each—to create national Christian Churches.

This desire has attained its fullest expression in the Proposals for creating a South Indian Church, which are subject to careful explanations and criticisms in the Memoranda published below, and the first stages have been reached in the case of Persia. In China and Japan the progress has not been so rapid, but the scheme put forward for a South Indian Church is attracting attention throughout the whole East, and everywhere people's eyes are fixed on it and on the attitude which may be adopted towards it by the Lambeth Conference. We propose to confine our report to the pro-

posals of Persia and South India, without, however, expressing any opinion.

(1) Persia.

The following account of the movement in Persia has been supplied to us. In this country, in the South, the field has been occupied for the past sixty years by the Church Missionary Society. The American Presbyterian Board entered North Persia about the same time, and took over the existing work of another American mission. As the result there are now 3,000 Christians, adherents of these missions, large numbers of them converts from Islam. Work has been separate in the two parts of the country. Political change in the country, the influence of western ideas, the provision of good roads, together with quick and unusually cheap transport, has resulted in these groups of Christians in the North and South being brought together. The result has been that they, as two small groups in the face of a population, non-Christian, save for the members of the ancient Armenian and Assyrian Churches who are domiciled in Persia, have felt both the need and the desire of being one and of having one Church. So strongly has this been felt that at a Conference in Hamadan in 1925 and at another conference at Isfahan in 1927 the groups had decided to become one Church.

As regards this conference the Bishop in Persia writes :—

" It is too soon yet to say much as to the ultimate results we hope for from the Inter-Church Conference. . . . It is not, out here, an academic subject for a debating society discussion, but a vital matter affecting the very life of the Church. It is not surprising that Persian Christians should be somewhat impatient when they hear of the leaders at home, who say that the Church in the Mission Field must not imperil the larger unity by any premature action on the part of the Church in the Mission Field. Persian Christians naturally reply, Why should the very life of our Church be imperilled because Christians in England and elsewhere cannot settle their age-long differences with which we have practically no concern ? And it is hard to say that these Christians out here have not a good deal on their side.

" They have postponed action, until after the next Lambeth Conference, but many of us detected a note running through the discussions, which perhaps was a warning, that they will

then go ahead on their own, and give outward expression to a unity which already exists and which is deeper than any outward forms."

The scheme of union is contained in a Report "unanimously approved by the Inter-Church Conference of the Evangelical Churches of all Persia held at Isfahan, July 23 to August 5, 1927." It is based upon the Report of the Joint Conference of the Representatives of the Church of England and the Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches held at Lambeth in 1922 and presents a marked resemblance also to the Reports of the Lausanne Conference.

It accepts the Scriptures, the Apostles and Nicene Creeds. "We believe that the use of these creeds in worship, while not binding on any Church, will prove a helpful expression of united belief: and we feel that assent to them should allow of reasonable liberty of interpretation."

Of the Church it is said: "We regard the Church as the Body of Christ and His Spirit in the abiding in its members as the source of its life. There can be only one Church and this Church consists of all those, in times past and present, who have been saved through faith in Christ. As a visible organisation the Church was founded by Christ as the means of the growth of the Kingdom of God on earth. Local Churches are representatives and parts of the one Catholic Church."

There may be variety in worship, but greater uniformity is desired:

"Whereas local Churches should be free to adopt such form of worship as they may choose, a closer approach to a common standard than now exists, and one better adapted to the Persian genius, is highly desirable."

As regards the Ministry it says:

"We feel that in the United Church of Persia the offices of Episcopos (Bishop) and Presbuteros (Presbyter), both mentioned in the New Testament, should be preserved in some form, and that at the same time the rights of the local congregation, in accordance with New Testament teaching, should be fully guarded so as to produce and preserve the harmonious working of the whole body of the Church and to prevent undue concentration of power in the hands of a single person or group of persons."

Among the steps towards union are the following :—

" We ask Bishop Linton to present to the Lambeth Conference of Bishops which convenes in 1930 the present status of the Evangelical Churches in Persia—their fervent desire for union, their present plastic state, their need of unhampered freedom in working out their own development, the fundamental principles of union they have adopted and the urgency for action. And this Inter-Church Conference most earnestly petitions this Conference of Bishops, or whatever Body has the authority, to extend to the Diocese of Persia independence from the See of Canterbury, that its Bishop and Ministers may be free to take such steps as they feel led by God to take toward the consummation of the Union of the Evangelical Churches of Persia on the basis of the above statement of fundamental principles of union. . . ."

" We similarly ask these ministers belonging to East Persia Presbytery, whenever there is an immediate prospect of the formation of the United Church of Persia, to take the necessary steps to secure from the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America the dissolution of this Presbytery. . . . We recommend that, if possible, at all future ordinations of ministers in our two divisions of the Church prior to the consummation of Union, two ordained ministers from the Northern (Presbyterian) Churches join in the laying on of hands at the ordination of our Episcopal Ministers and similarly the Bishop at the ordination of a minister in the Northern Churches."

There is another aspect of the Persian Church question which must be noted. The American Presbyterian Mission in the past made converts amongst the members of the ancient Eastern Churches. To-day its evangelistic efforts are directed towards Islam and they are making a considerable number of Moslem converts. The Anglican Church in the Church Missionary Society area is composed of Moslem converts with a few drawn from Judaism and Zoroastrianism. A negligible number of Armenians were admitted to the Church a long time ago, but the Bishop has set his face steadily against admitting members of the Eastern Churches into our Church.

2. The South Indian Scheme.

As an introduction to the two memoranda on the South Indian scheme (Appendix 8 and 9), the following information is given :

It is a proposal to unite the following Churches :—

1. The Church of India, Burma and Ceylon (formerly known as the Church of England in India) with regard to the dioceses of Madras ; Tinnevelly, Madura and Ramnad ; Dornakal ; and Travancore and Cochin.

2. The South India United Church.

This Church is the result of a movement which brought into organic union the Churches in South India and Ceylon established by the Missions of certain Presbyterian (Reformed) Churches in Great Britain and the United States of America ; the London Missionary Society and the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, both of which are supported mainly by Congregational Churches ; and (in the Malabar District) by the Basel Evangelical Mission, a union mission supported by Lutheran and Reformed (Presbyterian) Churches in Germany and Switzerland.

3. The South India Province of the Wesleyan Methodist Church, including the districts of Madras ; Negapatam and Trichinopoly ; Hyderabad and Mysore.

The number of Christians included in these churches was at the last enumeration nearly 800,000, and is continually growing. It is made up as follows :—

Anglicans	395,883
Wesleyans	111,556
S.I.U.C.	231,435
	738,874

The scheme which has been prepared is the result of negotiations which have been going on for some ten years. The full scheme drawn up for presentation to the governing bodies of the Churches has been published in an Indian and an English edition.

The Committee desire to note the following points in regard to this scheme :—

(i.) The scheme is avowedly based on the proposals of the Lambeth Conference, as the following statement shows*:—

* These words are quoted in the introduction from the Scheme of the Indian Ministers who met in Tranquebar in 1919.

" Upon this common ground of the Historic Episcopate and of the spiritual equality of all members of the two Churches, we propose union on the following terms :—

1. The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, as containing all things necessary for salvation.

2. The Apostles Creed and the Nicene Creed.

3. The two Sacraments ordained by Christ Himself—Baptism and the Lord's Supper.

4. The Historic Episcopate, locally adapted."

(ii.) If the various resolutions of the Lambeth Conference of 1920 on reunion are examined, and especially those relating to Reunion with Non-Episcopal Churches are studied, it will be found that they contemplate a period during which ministers who are episcopally ordained and those not episcopally ordained are working side by side.

The following are the conditions laid down by the Lambeth Conference for an interim period before complete unity is attained :—

" Some Provinces of our communion, while agreeing to unite with a non-episcopal communion on the basis of the acceptance of Episcopacy for the future, might be faced with the necessity of providing for the contingency that many ministers who at the time of the union were working in the non-episcopal communion would remain after the union without episcopal ordination. The following suggestions appear to us to satisfy the conditions of local freedom explained above :—

(*a*) Ministers of both the uniting communions should be at once recognised as of equal status in all Synods and Councils of the United Church.

(*b*) The terms of union should not confer on non-episcopally ordained ministers the right to administer the Holy Communion to those congregations which already possess an episcopal ministry, but they should include the right to conduct other services and to preach in such churches if licensed thereto by the Bishop.

(*c*) All other matters might well be left to the decision of the Provincial or General Synods of the United Church, in full confidence that these Synods will take care not to endanger that fellowship with the Universal Church which is our common ultimate aim."

With these regulations of the Lambeth Conference we may compare the regulations of the proposed scheme of union :—

" It is [equally] the intention of the Uniting Churches that the United Church shall in its legislation and executive acts respect the conscientious convictions of its ministers and members."

" It will in these matters avoid, on the one hand, any encouragement of licence in condonation of breaches of Church comity and fellowship, and, on the other hand, any unchristian rigidity in its regulations or in their applications ; and in all its actions it will seek the preservation of unity within, the attainment of wider union, and the avoidance of immediate contests in particular cases.

" The complete spiritual unity within the Church in South India, which is the aim of the Uniting Churches, will not be attained till all the members of the United Churches are willing and wishful to receive communion equally in all of its churches, and it is the resolve of the Uniting Churches to do all in their power to that end.

" They recognise that the act of union will initiate a process of growing together into one life and of advance towards that complete spiritual unity. If during this process difficulties and anomalies arise the United Churches will be careful not to allow any over-riding of conscience by Church authorities or by majorities ; nor will it in its administrative acts knowingly transgress the long-established traditions of any of the Uniting Churches.

" They believe that these ends can rightly be attained not by the framing of detailed regulations, but by assurances given and received in a spirit of mutual confidence and love.

" They therefore pledge themselves and fully trust each other that in the United Church no arrangements with regard to churches, congregations or ministers will knowingly be made, either generally or in particular cases, which would offend the conscientious convictions of any persons directly concerned, or which would hinder the development of complete unity within the Church or imperil its subsequent progress towards union with other Churches."

(iii.) The following passages show the opinion expressed concerning the ministry.

" The Uniting Churches, recognising that the Episcopate, the Councils of the Presbyters and the Congregation of the Faithful must all have their appropriate places in the order of life of the United Church, accept in particular the historic episcopate in a constitutional form as part of their basis of unity, without intending thereby to imply or to express a judgment in anything concerning episcopacy."

" Every ordination of Presbyters shall be performed by the laying on of hands of the Bishop and Presbyters, and all consecrations of bishops shall be performed by bishops, not less than three taking part in any consecration."

" The Uniting Churches agree that it is their intention and expectation that eventually every minister exercising a permanent ministry in the United Church will be an episcopally ordained minister."

(iv.) Abundant evidence has come before the Committee of the importance of this scheme, and of the results which it is alleged will depend upon the attitude of the Lambeth Conference towards it. It is stated that there is a great and increasing movement towards Christian unity throughout the Mission Field. The question, we are told, that is hanging in the balance is whether the united National Churches shall be organised on Catholic and historical lines or whether they shall represent an amorphous collection of independent churches and congregations. The South Indian scheme is stated to aim at creating a corporate organised body, in communion with the Church of England and in the future with other Christian bodies. If this experiment be successful the example will be followed it is believed elsewhere. If this scheme be rejected it will be a matter of some doubt, so we are told, whether the Christian Church, or at any rate Evangelical Christianity, will be able to organise itself against the strong un-Christian and anti-Christian National organisations which are springing up in the East.

III. CONCLUSION.

We have appended to this report a series of Memoranda. The writers alone are responsible for the opinions expressed. The Committee is not responsible for anything except the fact of publication. In the case of the South Indian Church Scheme, the most useful way of dealing with the question

seemed to be to give two memoranda expressing different points of view. We are conscious of the imperfect manner in which we have accomplished the work with which we were entrusted. We found the time inadequate for what we wished to do. Many of us also had hardly sufficient leisure for the work. We can only express a hope to your Graces that what we have done, however imperfect, may have some value both in facilitating the work of the Lambeth Conference and in informing the public mind on the important questions at issue.

In conclusion we would take this opportunity of expressing our thanks to our Secretary, Dr. Tissington Tatlow, and our Assistant Secretary, Miss Latford, for the assiduous help they have given us.

A. C. Gloucestr: (*Chairman*).
H. N. Bate.
Florence Cecil.
Mary Codrington. (1)
Arthur W. Davies.
J. A. Douglas. (2)
Staunton Fulham.
Nugent Gibraltar.
Charles Gore. (1)
John Guildford.
James O. Hannay.
F. B. Macnutt.
Albert Mitchell. (3 and 4)
Edwin James Palmer.
A. G. Pite. (4)
Oliver Quick.
Athelstan Riley. (5)
Ruth Rouse. (4)
St. Clair Sarum:
Tissington Tatlow (*Honorary Secretary*).
W. A. Wigram.
Theodore Winton:
Edward S. Woods. (4)

---

(1) *See* Note 1.
(2) *See* Note 2.
(3) *See* Note 3.
(4) *See* Note 4.
(5) *See* Note 5.

NOTE 1.

In signing this Report we desire to make the following reservation: we cannot accept the clause quoted from the Report of "the Joint Conference" on p. 24 even in view of the words which follow. Nor for similar reasons can we accept phrases which occur in the next paragraph of this Report. Our reasons appear in Bishop Gore's memorandum on Validity appended to this report (p. 55) and also in his memorandum on the South Indian Scheme (p. 100).

CHARLES GORE.
MARY CODRINGTON.

NOTE 2.

In regard to *The Ministry of the Church*, Part I, Section 5, I dissent from the whole of the three paragraphs of subsection 3, beginning p. 23 with "The conditions" and ending p. 24 with "under discussion," on the ground that they are vague in tenor and may be interpreted as authenticating a theory of the Church and of the ministry which I believe to be erroneous. J. A. DOUGLAS.

NOTE 3.

My signature to the foregoing Report is subject to the following qualifications:—

1. In the comments upon Lausanne Report V as to the Ministry of the Church I think that the period of the persistence of "one main type of ministerial order" is, on the historical evidence available, somewhat overstated; and I do not think that the references to "the ancient historic Churches" are happily phrased, seeing that that title cannot fairly be used so as to exclude the Church of Scotland, at the least. Nor do I agree that the "other communions" possess a Ministry necessarily differing "in function" from the episcopal churches. There are several other statements in that section of the Report to which I can assent only by

putting upon them a meaning that I cannot suppose to be intended by the majority of my colleagues.

2. I am compelled to dissent from the greater part of the Section of the Report dealing with the Sacraments. The reference to the Catechism is unfortunate. The Catechism states categorically that Christ hath ordained two Sacraments only in His Church. The contemporary Latin (1670) version is significant " Duo tantum quae quidem in genere necessaria sint ad salutem consequendam, nempe Baptismum et Coenam Domini." This definition does not merely " draw the distinction " ; it totally ignores " all the others " which Article XXV says " have not like nature of Sacraments with Baptism and the Lord's Supper," and are " such as have grown partly of the corrupt following of the Apostles, partly are states of life allowed in the Scriptures." It follows that I dissent from any implication that "the Church of England is concerned to maintain that " Penance or Extreme Unction " are . . . means of grace to those who resort to them with right dispositions " and from the consequent references to those practices. I do not recognise any connection between the so-called sacrament of Penance and the judiciously guarded provision in the Liturgy for the Christian who " cannot quiet his own conscience " to " open his grief, that by the ministry of God's holy word, he may receive the benefit of absolution, together with ghostly counsel and advice, to the quieting of his conscience, and avoiding of all scruple and doubtfulness " ; especially when those words are contrasted with those for which they were substituted. In this connection I recall that, in 1662, the use of the Absolution in the Visitation Service was expressly conditioned " if he (*i.e.*, the sick man) humbly and heartily desire it "— words absent in the earlier Prayer Books.

In the last paragraph of this section of the Report I dissociate myself from any possible implication that the words of St. Paul, " By grace ye have been saved through faith," or similar scriptural phrases, have any sacramental reference ; the emphasis always is in holy Writ on " the grace of God " or " the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ " ; and I think that the Report suffers by the absence of any definition of the meaning or application of the word " grace."

3. In relation to the section of the Report relating to the

Reunion of Christendom I desire (in addition to what is said in the Note in which I have joined with three of my colleagues) to say that I cannot think it right to defer or postpone the practical question of the lawfulness of the individual Christian seeking and being permitted without reproach to communicate otherwhere than in his or her own Church or Communion (with the goodwill of each Church or Communion affected) until the confessedly difficult diverse views of ministerial commission have been fully accommodated. I do not regard this matter with limitation to special and abnormal occasions.

ALBERT MITCHELL.

NOTE 4

We are unable to give unreserved assent to the words of the Report on United Communion Services. These are defined in the paragraph to which we refer as "Services organised jointly by Anglican and authorities of other churches with which we are not at present in communion" and are distinguished from the open Anglican Communion Services to which the next paragraph of the Report asks the Lambeth Conference to give attention.

We believe that such Services should not be regarded as possible only when organic unity is at last achieved. While realising the real difficulties of various kinds connected with the holding of such Services, and desiring that no pressure should ever be brought to bear on those who cannot conscientiously approve of such Services, we feel that no suggestion whatever of disloyalty should be made to hinder those Anglicans, and they are not a few, who desire to join in such Services.

We are convinced from what we know to be the experience of many that United Communion Services on special occasions as defined in the Report, tend to promote a deep and lasting desire for Reunion, especially when such Services are the expression of some new fellowship between Christians of different groups.

We would emphasise that our Lord, at the time of the institution of the Sacrament, laid stress on the need for a demonstration of unity and love amongst his followers in

order to bring conviction to " the world " ; and we believe that the absence of United Communion Services in connection with united evangelistic and missionary efforts weakens the effect of such efforts on " the world " and is a stumbling block to the spread of the Gospel. We are certain that this view is supported by the experience of interdenominational movements in this country and abroad, especially amongst young people, students and others.

We recall the words of the Lambeth appeal of 1920 : " We acknowledge all those who believe in our Lord Jesus Christ, and have been baptised into the name of the Holy Trinity, as sharing with us membership in the universal Church of Christ which is His Body," and believe that these words should carry with them acknowledgment of the right of all in such membership to join together in the chief service of Christian fellowship at least on special occasions.

Albert Mitchell.
A. G. Pite.
Ruth Rouse.
Edward S. Woods.

NOTE 5.

Note to " 2. How far," etc., on page 16, with a cross reference to the last clause of 2 on page 18 :

We must not assume the validity of an antithesis between Scripture and Tradition, an antithesis begotten of past controversies. On the contrary, we of the Anglican Communion should endeavour to establish a synthesis between the teaching of the historic Churches and the Churches of the Reformation.

1. We must be careful to define our terms. The word " Tradition " is used of the customs of individual Churches, often quite unimportant and dating from recent times. This must be carefully distinguished from the ecclesiastical and historical use of the term as denoting something claiming to come from Christ and His Apostles.

2. That the Gospel was first taught orally nobody will deny. Tradition is prior to the New Testament Scriptures ; St. Paul appeals to it before the Gospels were written. Indeed the New Testament is nothing but Tradition crystal-

lised at different dates from which emerged by degrees the New Testament Canon.

3. The Faith and Order of the Church proceed from both, each being checked by the other. First, as to Faith ; the doctrine of the Blessed Trinity is an example. Biblical critics assure us that the well-known passage about the Heavenly Witnesses is an interpolation. This can only mean that it is tradition crystallised later than the rest of the Johannine Epistle. But without this tradition the doctrine of the Trinity, a fundamental dogma of Christianity, is not directly stated in Holy Scriptures. Again, the Oecumenical Councils were gatherings of Bishops, with the book of the Gospels placed significantly and symbolically in their midst, to testify to the traditions of their Churches on questions of Faith which had arisen and which appeals to the mere text of the Scriptures had been unable to solve. From these Councils came the Oecumenical Creeds, documents which are consonant with both Scripture and Tradition because the two sources of Faith are really inseparable. Secondly, as to Order. A very reasonable explanation of the Episcopate, emerging so suddenly and universally in the sub-apostolic age, is that it formed part of the detailed instruction given by our Lord to His Apostles, alluded to in the opening verses of the Acts, and it is founded upon no greater direct Scriptural testimony than the doctrine of the Blessed Trinity. But if it formed part of this instruction (it certainly rests on the highest authority of Tradition) the discussion about the *esse* and the *bene esse* of episcopacy seems to lose its interest, even if it is of any use at all.

Note to iii. *on page* 22.—The practice of the Anglican communion of ordaining ministers of non-episcopal Churches and receiving without ordination the priests of episcopal Churches points to a definite theory, and to episcopacy being considered as the *esse*, for nothing less than necessity could excuse such a difference of treatment. Secondly, the imposition of hands on such ministers must mean the transmission of grace, otherwise it is a " dark and dumb " ceremony and liable to lead to superstition.

ATHELSTAN RILEY.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1

THE CHARACTER OF THE RESPONSE TO THE LAUSANNE REPORTS.

By the Very Rev. Dean Bate.

The Secretariat of the World Conference on Faith and Order has communicated to the members of the Continuation Committee a series of summaries of the documents issued and of the action taken by a large number of Churches in response to the Lausanne Reports. It has also circulated a certain number of documents *in extenso*. Most of the matter thus sent out records the reception given to the Reports and the appointment of commissions to consider them. While there is evidence of world-wide interest in the Lausanne material, the process of reporting to the churches and of obtaining their considered judgments is not one that can be hastened, and the number of complete responses now available is not large.

The first response made was a sympathetic message from the Old Catholic Bishops, received at the end of 1927. During 1928 and 1929 replies have come in from all the Methodist communities in this country, from the Baptist Union, and from the Churches of Christ in Great Britain ; of the Presbyterian bodies, the United Free Church of Scotland deferred sending a reply until it could be done in the name of a reunited church, but the Church of Scotland (before union) has indicated its attitude to the main problems raised at Lausanne, and the Presbyterian Church of Ireland has reported fully. No report has come in from the Lutheran and Reformed Churches in Germany ; the numerous *Landeskirchen* are acting through a central committee which has not yet concluded its labours ; the Lutheran Church in the United States, while accepting a preliminary report, is still pursuing its enquiries. The Swedish Committee, however, and the Church of Norway have each sent in careful memoranda. The South India United Church has also passed a report, but only the first draft of this is at the moment available.

No complete answer has come from any part of the Anglican Communion, from any of the Orthodox Churches, or from

any body of Congregationalists. The Report of the Congregational Union in this country, which was referred back for re-consideration in 1929, will be available, it is hoped, early this summer. It is notable that of all the communions in the United States which were represented at Lausanne not one has yet reported in detail.

The material now available for consideration is thus somewhat fragmentary, and much of it, *e.g.*, especially that from Sweden and Norway, is too full and closely reasoned to admit of being justly represented in a summary. It has seemed best, therefore, not to analyse each report separately, but to attempt a general sketch, indicating the tendencies which the material as a whole seems to exhibit.

The first impression conveyed by the responses and records of action is that the holding of the Lausanne conference has been approved, and its documents welcomed, all over the world. Only one communion, the Wesleyan Methodist Church in South Africa, has expressed a clearly unfavourable opinion. Elsewhere the continuance of the work begun at Lausanne is urged, and promises of support are given.

Next it is to be observed that, as was to be expected, the first instinct of every church is to compare the Lausanne Reports with its own formularies and traditions, and to approve or criticise them accordingly. There are, indeed, answers which go beyond this, and show that some churches are willing now to consider what new steps they would be prepared to contemplate for the sake of unity. In this context it is interesting to compare the lines of study recommended to the (Reformed) churches of the *Schweitzerischer Kirchenbund* and to the *Union Nationale des Eglises Reformées Evangéliques de France*. In both the spirit of conciliation is earnestly recommended, but in the former a strong emphasis is laid on the relation of the Lausanne Reports to the Protestant inheritance and the controversy with Rome, while in the latter, though its tone is no less definitely Protestant, the problems of the Ministry and the Sacraments are approached with a singularly open mind, and it is intimated that the present teaching and practice of the Reformed Churches in relation to the Sacraments are seriously in need of revision. It may be that in the second stage of the Lausanne discussions an increasing number of churches will be ready to

consider how far, in view of the urgent need of unity, a revision of their traditions is desirable.

Taking the Reports one by one, it is clear that those on the *Call to Unity* and the *Gospel* have met with wide acceptance. Many communions accept both without criticism; some make reservations with regard to the meaning of the word "unity" or to isolated points of doctrine which appear to them to require greater emphasis, but none suggests any vital amendment.

On the subject of the *Nature of the Church* it becomes clear from the responses that but little progress has been made towards transcending the deep divergences which divide Christian opinion. It is plain, from the fullness with which this Report is discussed, and from the interest shewn in the problems upon which disagreement was recorded at Lausanne, that in any continuation of the Conference's work this is the point at which discussion would have to begin, and which indeed the churches are most ready to discuss.

The judgments expressed on the *Church's Common Confession of Faith* reveal a real convergence of thought with regard to the substance of the great Creeds. The responding churches differ widely in respect of the use which they have in the past made of these confessions, and of their attitude to formal creeds in general; some of them are anxious that the use of particular confessions should be maintained; many desire to safeguard the *fides qua* against any over-emphasis of the *fides quae creditur*; but there is more general readiness than might have been expected to recognise the Nicene and Apostles' Creeds as witnesses to essential truth.

With regard to the *Ministry* it is specially important to remember how relatively scanty the available answers are. It is doubtful whether, if they were more nearly complete, it would be possible to say that the tentative suggestions of the Lausanne Report towards a ministry "universally recognised" were likely to be widely accepted. In those which have come in there is at least a readiness to consider those suggestions, and to admit that episcopal, presbyteral and congregational "elements" would each of them have something to contribute to the life of a re-united Church. Thus the Church of Scotland says that the possibility of the incorporation of other elements (than those which it now

recognises) to satisfy those who deem them essential cannot be ruled out without further consideration; and other churches, while refusing to admit that episcopacy, or indeed any form of order, is essential, seem prepared to discuss the expediency of an episcopate, or even its practical necessity for the sake of unity. At the same time there is a strong general insistence on the importance of those "conditions" upon which the suggestions mentioned in the Report were made to depend.

On the subject of the *Sacraments* there is at least the possibility of further fruitful discussion. The Baptist Union, indeed, notes that the evangelical and the sacerdotal types of church are so strongly divergent that it does not appear desirable or possible that these two should be welded into one. Other churches are anxious to safeguard the conviction that there are ways other than the sacramental in which saving grace is communicated, and that the Church must make room for those who use no sacraments. But on the whole the positive statements of the Report meet with encouraging endorsement, and the reality of the Sacraments of the Gospel as means of grace is affirmed. Beyond this there is room and demand for the consideration of the meaning of "grace" in this context (a problem on which the Theological Committee of the Conference is engaged); and, however strongly the churches may express themselves on the importance or unimportance of the conditions under which sacraments are ministered, it is clear that the problems turning on the notion of "validity" require much fuller examination than they have received.

On Report VII the positive suggestions for practical co-operation and fuller mutual understanding at the present time are everywhere welcomed. Further discussion appears to be desired upon two large questions, namely the place which acts of intercommunion should hold in a reunion movement and the value of "federation" as a mode of union or a stage in the progress towards unity.

The documents on which the above summary description is based are worthy of careful study. The Secretariat of the movement (P.O. Box 226, Boston, Mass., U.S.A.) would doubtless do all in its power to facilitate such study; enquiries may also be addressed to me at the Deanery, Hadleigh, Suffolk.

Appendix 2

THE NUMBER OF THE SACRAMENTS.

By Bishop E. J. Palmer.

At the Lausanne Conference the Orthodox Representatives frequently recurred to the necessity, as they considered, that it should be acknowledged that there are seven Sacraments.

The Orthodox are not concerned to insist on the number of the Sacraments so much as on the indispensability of each of them, as having been instituted by our Lord, whether personally, or through His Apostles.

The Roman Church at the Council of Trent defined under anathema, that there are seven Sacraments, no more and no less. It defined further that they were all instituted by Christ Himself, but it refrained from saying that He instituted them directly and immediately, and this last proposition is therefore not a matter of faith in the Roman Church.

Taking these present-day facts as a starting point, let us go back to the history of the matter. There is no evidence of a doctrine that the number of the Sacraments is seven before the 12th century. For the West it is known who was responsible for the adoption of this doctrine. It was Peter Lombard (died 1164), who may possibly have been anticipated in teaching it by Otto of Bamberg (between 1124 and 1128). For the East, the earliest dates adduced are those of Job the Monk (1270) and the profession of faith of Michael Palaeologus at the Council of Lyons (1274).

What was the previous history? There were certain ordinances in the Church to which great importance was attached. There were two words, neither appropriate, μυστήριον and sacramentum, which were applied to such ordinances in the East and West respectively. There were no fixed definitions of the sense in which either term was used, and no fixed opinion about the number of the ordinances to which the terms were applicable.

Somewhat fuller explanation may be given of these statements. The typical use of the word μυστήριον in St. Paul is to signify something hitherto secret which God now

desires to be proclaimed. But the normal use of it in Greek was for a secret only to be explained to a privileged few, the initiate. It is in this sense apparently that it was applied to the Sacraments. The word " sacramentum " for some unknown reason was chosen to translate μυστήριον in Latin versions of the New Testament. It appears, even earlier, in the letter of Pliny. If the sense of the soldier's oath of loyalty to his general was in the minds of those who first applied it to Christian Sacraments, it is appropriate only to baptism and then only, if the human part in baptism is thought of as the characteristic feature of that rite. Neither of the words μυστήριον and sacramentum has anything whatever to do with an " outward sign."

From such unsuitable words there was little to be learned concerning the nature of the Sacraments. The denotation of the words has a history which may be sketched. In the West for the first four centuries two or three Sacraments are usually enumerated. When two only, this is sometimes because Confirmation is considered to be a part of Baptism. From the end of the 4th to the end of the 10th century the enumeration of three Sacraments, Baptism, Confirmation, and the Eucharist prevails ; probably because during that period the separation in time of Baptism and Confirmation was growing more and more general. From the end of the 10th century to the middle of the 12th the tendency to call other ordinances Sacraments, of which sporadic examples occur previously, became pronounced. Hugo of St. Victor enumerated twenty, but he classified them, placing in the first class " two necessary Sacraments," Baptism and the Eucharist. With the middle of the 12th century we come to Peter Lombard and his doctrine of seven Sacraments, which was generally accepted.

In the Eastern Church the word μυστήριον, which had at least an intelligible application, may have caused a tendency to greater variations in the matter of the number of the Sacraments than is to be observed in the early periods in the West. In the " Ecclesiastical Hierarchy " (5th or 6th century) the Pseudo-Dionysius enumerates six Sacraments in two triads, (1) Baptism, communion, consecration and use of chrism (τελειωτικὴ χρίσις) and (2) Consecration of Priests, consecration of monks, and an elaborate funeral service, which

Dr. John Wordsworth describes as " Consecration of the departed " (J. Wordsworth, *Ministry of Grace*, p. 60). Possibly, as the late Bishop of Salisbury suggests, the great respect in which this work was held prevented the Easterns " from attaching too much weight to the sevenfold Western scholastic division." Since the answers of the Patriarch Jeremiah II to the Lutherans (1576), all Orthodox writers affirm that there are seven Sacraments of Divine institution, no more and no less, though distinctions are drawn in regard to their necessity, etc., and Baptism and the Eucharist are always given pre-eminence.

How far did definitions dictate the number of Sacraments given at different times, or how far did the number of the Sacraments actually accepted dictate the definitions? It would need much more learning and greater space than are at my commend to answer those questions. In the West, it is obvious that when once St. Augustine's definition, " signs when they relate to sacred things are called Sacraments " (signa cum ad res divinas pertinent, sacramenta appellantur, *Ep.* 138) came to be accepted, the way was prepared for such extensive enumerations as Hugo of St. Victor made. It is curious that this tendency to multiply Sacraments did not prevail earlier. The restriction of Sacraments to seven was made by the Master of the Sentences concurrently with his definition, " Sacramentum proprie dicitur quod ita signum est gratiae Dei et invisibilis gratiae forma ut ipsius imaginem gerat et causa existat." Again, when the Augsburg Confession had declared that " sacraments were instituted to be signs and evidences of the good will of God towards us, which are set forth in order to excite and confirm faith in those who use them," this was connected with a reduction in the number of Sacraments by the authors of the Confession.

It should be noted that while the determination of the number of the Sacraments as seven appears first in the 12th century, the insistence on a proper form and proper matter in Sacraments is nearly a century later (1215),* and is

* It would have been more philosophical to retain the Patristic distinctions between " sign " (which included both the matter and the form as later defined) and the invisible thing, and between *sacramentum* and *res sacramenti*. Even St. Thomas is very hard put to it to find a matter for Penance or Matrimony.

the PACIFIC LIBRARY

incompatible with the claim of at least two to the title. But the glamour of the number seven has, even so, prevailed, and it may have had something to do with the formation of Peter Lombard's list.

The general result of our enquiry is that the pre-eminence to be attached to Baptism and the Lord's Supper is agreed upon in all ages and by all Churches ; that the fixing of the number of the Sacraments at seven is not earlier than the 12th century ; and that the definitions of the word Sacrament are all afterthoughts, and have varied so much that it is impossible to extract from them an answer to the question, What is the number of the Sacraments ? The only question of importance is, What place in the life of the Church have the seven rites which the Roman Church calls Sacraments and the Orthodox mysteries ?

Appendix 3

THE VALIDITY OF THE SACRAMENTS.

By The Rt. Rev. Bishop Gore.

Validity is an English word derived from Latin words (*validus*, *validitas*) which again are a translation of the Greek (bebaios, bebaiotes). In Christian history the word in a technical sense appears first in Ignatius (*ad Smyrn.* 8, *c.* A.D. 110), "Let that be held a valid eucharist which is under the bishop (*i.e.* at which he presides) or someone to whom he has intrusted it." But the idea of validity was widely current at the time. In Moulton and Milligan's *Vocabulary of the Greek Testament* much valuable information will be found under the headings βέβαιος, βεβαιῶ, βεβαίωσις. "Deissmann has shown very fully how much force the technical use of this word and its cognates to denote legally guaranteed security adds to their occurrence in the N.T." The evidence from the papyri is abundant and illuminating; and the editors add "The papyri discovered since Deissmann's pioneer work was published support with numerous examples his thesis that the word must always be read with the technical sense in mind." The idea of invalidity was conveyed by the Greek words ἄκυρος ἀκυροῦν ἀκύρωσις or ἀθετοῦν ἀθέτησις (see *sub voc.*).

The idea is sufficiently plain. It is quasi-legal. Every organised society needs the distinction between acts which carry with them *the security of official guarantee* and those which do not. The Christian society needed such a distinction. Ignatius finds it in the authorisation of the bishop. No Christian should have anything to say to any sacrament administered otherwise than by the bishop or under his authority. So the word starts on its career. The idea which tended to prevail in the early Church was substantially that of Ignatius, interpreted as meaning that no sacraments celebrated in schismatical bodies (which generally meant also heretical bodies) could be valid. The Church could not acknowledge them or guarantee them. This is still the view of the Eastern Church, though they have recognised that the Church can make valid by an *ex post facto* decision sacraments

which, as celebrated outside the Church, are not to be regarded as valid *per se*. But the influence of the Roman Church and of St. Augustine caused validity to be less rigorously defined in the West. Baptisms were recognised as valid and not to be repeated if only they had been celebrated with the right matter (water) and form (" In the name of the Father," etc.). In the case of the eucharist and of ordination what was required universally was not only the correct matter and form, but also the administration by a properly authorised official. Thus no eucharist was valid unless celebrated with bread and wine (matter) and with the recitation of the words of Christ, *This is my body, This is my blood* (form) *by a proper minister*, *i.e.*, at least a presbyter ordained to his office by the bishop. But under Augustine's influence it was finally admitted that even an heretical or schismatical presbyter could celebrate a valid, though irregular, sacrament. And with regard to ordination it was held (finally) that the necessary matter was the laying on of hands, the necessary form was some prayer for the gift of God appropriate to the particular office, and the necessary minister in the case of the three orders of bishop, presbyter or deacon was a bishop. In the case of ordination also the Augustinian view finally prevailed that ordinations performed in schism and heresy were to be regarded as valid if performed with the right matter and form by the proper minister.

There have been endless disputes over details, but the details do not affect the general idea of validity, nor the positive requirement of an episcopally ordained presbyter for the celebration of the eucharist and of a bishop for the ordination of a man to any one of the greater orders.

At the Reformation our Church did not use the word validity or discuss the idea, but it assumed the consequences of the idea as held in the Western Church generally, viz., that an ordained person might be accepted into the Church without fresh ordination, but only if he had previously received episcopal ordination, and that only a presbyter, so duly ordained, might consecrate the eucharist.

Now it is obvious that very many questions may be raised about the details of validity in connection with the particular sacraments, and scholastic writers, with their infinite love of

subtle distinctions, have made the most of their opportunities. But it seems to me that six items are fairly clear.

(1) That no Christian Communion can do without the ideas of validity or invalidity, *e.g.*, as to what constitutes a valid or invalid marriage, as to who can or who cannot be recognised as a valid minister, or what conditions constitute a valid sacrament. I suppose no Church would recognise as a eucharist a meal, with whatever intention prepared or eaten, celebrated in beef and brandy.

(2) That no Christian who believes that the Church Catholic can " bind " and " loose " with divine sanction can doubt that it has bound (i.e., refused to recognise as valid) a eucharist celebrated by one who is not at least a presbyter, or an ordination performed by one who is not a bishop. This " binding " must be dated from very long before the division of East or West, and has been constantly observed by both East or West, in spite of differences of opinion on minor points.

(3) That the Church of England accepted at the time of the Reformation in the sixteenth century, and again with somewhat increased emphasis at the Restoration, the consequences of this principle, and made it a rule without exception that only presbyters duly ordained can celebrate the eucharist and only bishops can ordain.

(4) That the formal admission of exceptions to these rules to-day would violate the compact on the basis of which Catholic-minded and evangelically-minded persons have in the past been held together in the Church of England.

(5) That the admission of the principle of validity does not involve any such judgment on " invalid " sacraments as would contravene the principle that " God is not tied to His sacraments."

(6) That the quasi-legal idea of validity involves no more than that the Church universal has laid down certain positive conditions for the celebration of sacraments which must be observed in each particular case by those who are not in revolt from its authority. It is not concerned with any (less than universal) opinions which have been held, or additional requirements which have been made, in any epoch or place.

Appendix 4

THE MEANING OF VALIDITY.

By The Rt. Rev. Bishop E. J. Palmer.

Another method of approaching the subject of validity may be offered. The confusion that has arisen over the concept of *validity* is due to a confusion of the different meaning of the words βέβαιος, validus and valid.

1. " Validus " means having power, and, if applied to a Sacrament, it means that all those conditions are present in it, which are absolutely necessary to its being efficacious as a means of grace. Amongst those conditions are right dispositions on the part of the human persons affected by the Sacrament. Validity means thus the presence of the sum total of conditions absolutely or indispensably necessary to the efficacy of a Sacrament. Invalidity means the absence of some of these, and consequently a Sacrament which is invalid in this sense is also inefficacious. If one finds an efficacious Sacrament, it must have been valid, but that does not make efficacy equal to validity, for a valid Sacrament is one capable of conveying grace, and an efficacious Sacrament is one which has actually conveyed grace.

Upon this conception of validity, two things are to be noted. First, this validity is a minimum—the presence of the sum total of the conditions indispensable to efficacy. It is most improbable that any Sacrament ever took place which presented simply the indispensable conditions of efficacy and nothing more. The Church in giving instructions for the celebration of the Sacraments, would, if it had validity only in mind, instruct its clergy and people to do more than the minimum—it would not make barely certain, but amply certain, of doing the right thing. But obviously it would always have other things besides validity in mind, such as the honour of God and the order and unity of His Church. Therefore validity in this sense is an abstraction which will be difficult to make. A good example is the proper words to be used in a Sacrament. As the *Catholic Dictionary* (art. " Sacraments ") truly says, " The custom of the Church

in different ages and countries shows that the form is not fixed in its particular words. It is often very hard to determine what change in the form would render the Sacrament invalid." To this I should add that if in the course of history one of the supposed indispensable conditions of efficacy has been omitted, and yet efficacious Sacraments have taken place without it, that fact proves that the omitted condition was not indispensable, and is not material to the validity of the Sacrament. The second point to be noted is that this conception of validity does not in itself help us at all to determine *what are* the indispensably necessary conditions of the efficacy of a Sacrament.

2. "Valid" in English is a legal term, and is used to describe something to which the State has undertaken to give effect or to secure that effect shall be given. Two points are vital to this conception—viz., that the State alone has the power to give effect or secure that effect is given (say) to a will, and that the State explicitly lays down by positive enactment (not what morally ought to be done in making a will, but) what are the conditions to be fulfilled in making a will if the testator wants the State to exercise its power on behalf of his will. If this conception be logically worked out, it can be applied in two ways. God alone has the power to give effect to the Sacraments. What are the conditions which He has laid down, upon the fulfilment of which He will give effect? One answer is, Those few and simple things which our Lord is recorded to have laid down Himself, and faith on the part of the recipient. The other directions which the Church has from time to time given about the celebration of the Sacraments are directions about the best way of accomplishing it, not conditions laid down by the only Power that can give effect. The other answer is, The conditions on which God will give effect to a Sacrament are those things which the Lord commanded together with everything else which the Church, His plenipotentiary on earth, has added, and faith on the part of the recipient. Then arises the discussion about the questions, what has the Church commanded as His plenipotentiary on earth, and by what organ does it command—by custom, by Council, by Pope?

3. Βέβαιος means sure and certain, either of arguments,

etc., which are beyond dispute, or of things, which are established so as to be immoveable. If this word is applied to a Sacrament, it means " beyond dispute," or " beyond question or doubt," as it does in Ignatius *ad Smyrn.* 8, where the context is entirely concerned with dissensions, and in other places in his writings. This is very close to a use of the word " valid " which is popular with contemporary Anglo-Catholic theologians. For instance, Dr. N. P. Williams (in *Lausanne, Lambeth and South India*, p. 31) says that " ' validity ' means ' *a priori* reliability.' A ' valid ' celebration of the Eucharist is one which we can approach with confidence that all outward conditions necessary to constitute the rite have been fulfilled." Here, again, we are none the better till we know what those conditions are. The human fact behind this conception of validity is this. I want to know whether if I go to this celebration of the Eucharist with right dispositions, God will certainly give me the grace that He has attached to the Sacrament. There are two typical attitudes of mind which people take up towards this question. (*a*) Some say, " We cannot answer this question, but the Church ought to answer it for us, and has answered it." It was to these people that St. Ignatius says, " Go to a Eucharist which the Bishop is celebrating or someone whom he has authorised to celebrate for him, and you can feel quite happy : it will be all right." The later Church laid various restrictions on the Bishop, it took away his liberty to use what words he pleased ; it decided that he could only authorise another Bishop or a Priest to celebrate in his stead ; but it left him the superintendence of the Eucharist (as of other Sacraments) subject to the rules from time to time adopted. Thus it guarantees the rightness of the Sacraments to the worshippers. The worshipper is safe, for our Lord has promised that the Judge in Heaven will not allow him to suffer, if he accepts and acts upon the decisions of the Church, binding and loosing things. For S. Matt. 18, 18, certainly promises that the Divine Judge will accept pleas based on those decisions (cp. *New Commentary*, ed. Chas. Gore, note on S. Matt. 16, 19), though it does not imply that the Church will be infallible in all its decisions. Thus, in this view, " the validity of a Sacrament," means " reliability guaranteed by the Church." Invalidity

means simply the absence of this guarantee—it is not the same as either inefficacy or non-existence.

(*b*) The other attitude of mind about βεβαιότης is that one can be perfectly sure of God ; He is not a pedant nor a legalist ; He has purposely given through His Son simple instructions and through the Apostles simple examples about the Sacraments which can be followed without any elaborate precautions. So long as those instructions and those examples are followed, God's goodness and generosity will certainly give grace to worshippers coming with right dispositions. Of those who have such an attitude of mind, some do and some do not regard the rules of the historic Church as rules which it is obligatory to follow if the Sacraments are to be celebrated in the best way. These people have their sense of security about the Sacraments in their conception of God and His ways, and do not need to have that security guaranteed by the Church. Some of them who belong to Christian communities which have rejected the historic rules believe that they have indubitable experience of sacramental grace through Sacraments not so guaranteed, and put aside with great impatience the statement that those Sacraments are not good and efficacious Sacraments, as a man who had an unguaranteed watch which went perfectly would turn away from anyone who said to him, " That watch cannot be a good and efficient watch because it is not guaranteed."

In summing up this enquiry, I desire to submit that the really important questions about the Sacraments are not in any way elucidated by the introduction of the concept of validity. The two most important questions are (*a*) What is the relation of the Church to the Sacraments, *i.e.*, in what sense must the Sacraments be within the Church or under the authorisation of the Church ? and (*b*) Is a Minister ordained by a Bishop in the Apostolic succession necessary to any or all of the Sacraments ? In answering these questions the introduction of the concept of validity involves either an attempt to explain *obscurum per obscurius* or an argument in a circle.

The word *validitas*, so far as I can discover, does not occur in the *Summa* of S. Thomas. It would be a very good thing if in this respect we all of us would follow the example of the Angelic Doctor.

Appendix 5

MEANING AND CONDITIONS OF VALIDITY.

By the Rev. Canon Quick.

In Paragraph 5 the Report of the Lausanne Conference notes that "the Orthodox Church and others hold" that "a proper ministry" is necessary for the "valid administration" of the Sacraments. It is impossible rightly to determine and to apply the doctrine of the Church of England on this vital subject, unless we first clear up the ambiguity which lurks in the meaning of the terms quoted. It will be found on examination that the meaning of the word "proper" must depend on that of the more difficult word "valid." Thus the expression "valid administration of the Sacraments" might be taken to imply the possibility of a real administration of the Sacraments which is not "valid." And in that case a "proper" minister would mean a "duly authorised" minister, who nevertheless would not be regarded as a necessity for the very existence of the Sacrament itself. On the other hand, if it be understood that the Sacraments not validly administered are not the Sacraments at all, then the term "proper minister" naturally means one of an order to which the power (not merely the authority) to administer Sacraments is confined.

The term "valid" then is what chiefly needs discussion. In point of fact it is at the present day applied to Sacraments in at least three quite distinct meanings :—

1. A valid Sacrament = a Sacrament wherein the outward sign is effective or efficacious as a means of grace, an invalid Sacrament being the contrary of this. In this sense, of course, the same service of Holy Communion may be a valid Sacrament for one communicant and invalid for another. This usage of the term is confined to Evangelical theologians, some of whom still do not adequately recognise the fact that others are using it in a quite different sense.

2. A valid Sacrament = a Sacrament in which all the conditions essentially necessary for the existence of the Sacrament are fulfilled. An invalid Sacrament, being the contrary of this, is therefore not the Sacrament at all, though it would not

follow that such a rite might not by God's special mercy be made an efficacious means of grace to those who with faith partake in it. This usage is the one current and generally received in the Catholic Church of the West. Some Anglo-Catholic theologians, however, while accepting this definition of the term valid, would prefer to say that an invalid Sacrament is one where the said conditions are not *certainly* fulfilled. This qualification seems to make it impossible to distinguish between " invalid " and " doubtful " Sacraments.*

3. A valid Sacrament = a Sacrament which has, or may be reasonably presumed to have, the due authorisation or recognition of the Catholic Church ; an invalid Sacrament being one which lacks such authorisation or recognition. It may, of course, be held—as St. Cyprian at times did apparently hold—that the authorisation of the Church is one of the conditions essentially necessary for the existence of the Sacraments. In that case this third definition of a valid Sacrament has the same denotation as the second. But, if we follow the doctrine now generally received, at least in the West, that the Church's authorisation is not one of these necessary conditions,† the difference between definitions (2)

* Scholars point out that in patristic Greek the earliest equivalent of *validus* is bebaios. Thus Ignatius says that a Eucharist celebrated by the Bishop or his deputy is to be deemed bebaia (see H. N. Bate in *The Future of the Church of England*, p. 193). From this point of view the question, What is a valid Sacrament ? means not so much, " What constitutes the existence of the Sacrament ? " as " What is it in a Sacrament that gives us assurance in partaking of it ? " But the two questions really come to the same thing. For it is of the essence of a Christian Sacrament not merely to bestow spiritual gifts but also to provide " a pledge to assure us thereof." A Sacrament, therefore, which is really " doubtful," may be said to lack something which is essential to the very existence of the Sacrament itself. This is the real ground of the Cyprianic and primitive view, mentioned below, that there can be no Sacrament at all apart from the authorisation of the Church. The prevalent Western view, however, is that a Sacrament can be bebaion even though it be celebrated by an excommunicated minister who has been deprived of all authority.

† By Roman Catholic theologians the term *liceitas* is used for " authorisedness " or " regularity," and it is sharply distinguished from *validitas*. There are, however, cases where authorisation is held to be necessary for *validity*—viz., where a priest ministers Confirmation by special authority from the Pope, and where a priest's possession of *jurisdiction* is held to be necessary for the *validity* of absolution. (See Bulls of Benedict XIV, *Etsi Pastoralis* s. 3, and Pius VI, *Auctorem Fidei*, s. 37.) Marriage also may be invalidated, if performed by an unauthorised priest, even though the priest is not the proper minister of the Sacrament. (See Decree of Pius X, *Ne Temere*.)

and (3) is vitally important. If we adopt the third, we are obliged to admit the possibility that there may be genuine Baptisms, Eucharists, etc., which are nevertheless not valid ; and if we understand " recognition " as meaning " retrospective authorisation," it becomes conceivable that the Church by " recognising " Sacraments may actually validate them. The possibility and legitimacy of this third usage of the terms valid, validation, etc., appears to be implied in the works of some modern Anglican theologians, and also by the practice of the Eastern Church in recognising the Sacraments of other bodies on the principle of " economy."

Two conclusions of practical moment seem to follow from this attempt to disentangle the meanings of ambiguous terms :—

(*a*) If the Church of England is asked, and either consents or refuses, to " recognise," under whatever conditions or restrictions, the *validity* of Sacraments celebrated by ministers of non-episcopal bodies, it must be clearly understood in what sense the terms " recognise " and " validity " are being used. If " validity " is used according to definitions (1) or (2), then to " recognise " means simply to acknowledge the presence of something already there. In the case of definition (1) the recognition may be freely granted without prejudice to any principle of Catholic order, but of itself it involves no consequence affecting terms of reunion. In the case of definition (2) the recognition is a matter of controversy among different schools of Anglican theology ; and the controversy concerns simply a question of fact or truth—viz., whether the conditions essentially necessary to the existence of a Sacrament have or have not been fulfilled, when the minister has not received episcopal ordination. But the moment " validity " is used according to definition (3) to " recognise " also tends to change its meaning, and the whole question is transformed. It becomes hard to distinguish between " to recognise the validity of " and " to validate by recognising." The question ceases to be merely one of objective facts. It is rather a question whether the Church of England has power, authority or justification for bestowing some formal " recognition " which implies a further validation or authorisation of what is thus " recognised."

(*b*) It is a fact that Anglican Sacraments are neither authorised nor recognised at all by the main body of Western Catholics. According to definition (3), therefore, they cannot be fully valid now, however good may be their claim to full validation.* It follows that if it is maintained that Anglican Sacraments are fully valid, while those of non-episcopal bodies are not valid at all, this can only be done by sticking closely to definition (2), and excluding the Church's authorisation and recognition from the conditions constitutive of validity. In that case it becomes impossible in logic to plead that the ordinations of some "wandering bishop" are invalid, simply on the ground that they lack authorisation from any Church. And it is to be remembered that Anglican Bishops have in the past refused to accept the validity of such ordinations, though they have not formally pronounced against them.

Summary and Conclusions.

1. The main question as to the *meaning* of validity is whether it denotes simply the *reality* of a Sacrament (*i.e.*, that the *real* Sacrament has been performed, or *authorisedness* according to the divinely appointed order of the Church).

2. There is then the further question whether in fact "authorisedness" is, or is not, essential to "reality." Before St. Augustine, it would seem, the general tendency was to answer this question in the affirmative. After St. Augustine the Western Church decided in the negative.

3. The Roman Catholic Church, however, still rejects the

* It may seem possible at first sight to define a valid Sacrament as one conforming to conditions which the undivided Church has once recognised in principle as giving validity, even though at a given time a large part of the Church may fail to acknowledge in a particular case that the conditions have been fulfilled. If so, it might conceivably be claimed that the Church's authorisation is, indeed, necessary to validity, but that Anglican Sacraments have in principle, though not in fact, received it. But the claim breaks down in logic. The question must be asked: What *are* the conditions which the Church has recognised in principle as constitutive of validity? If these include the Church's authorisation or recognition, then Anglican Sacraments do not in fact fulfil the conditions, and this fact is sufficient to impair their validity. If, on the other hand, the conditions do not include the Church's authorisation or recognition, it can no longer be maintained that the ordinations of the "wandering bishop" are invalid on the ground that they are unauthorised. There seems to be no escape from this dilemma.

validity (*i.e.*, " reality ") of all Sacraments, except Baptism, performed in non-episcopal Communions, not on the ground that they are unauthorised, but because they can only be performed by a minister possessing a certain *character** which is only conferred through consecration or ordination by Bishops who have themselves received the *character* in succession from the Apostles. On the other hand, the R.C. Church holds that this *character* is *indelible* ; and therefore that, once a minister possesses it, he can continue to perform validly (*i.e.*, " really ") all those Sacraments for which the *character* has enabled him, even though he has become a heretic or schismatic.† The anomalies, not to say absurdities, which result from this method of separating " authorisedness " from " reality," are sufficiently obvious.

4. If we reject the post-Augustinian Western doctrine, we cannot return to the more primitive view, without acknowledging that, when the Church's order has been rent by schism, all Orders and Sacraments are of incomplete validity, in so far as their authorisation is necessarily defective.

---

* Marriage is exceptional, inasmuch as the proper ministers of this Sacrament are the contracting parties themselves.

† For a possible exception in the case of Penance, see footnote above.

Appendix 6

CONFIRMATION.

By the Rev. Canon Quick.

(A) *The Outward Part.*

Differences concerning the form, matter and proper minister of the Sacrament are well known.

As regards form and matter. It is generally allowed that in apostolic times Confirmation was conferred by imposition of hands, but before long anointing with oil became the main matter of the rite. In the Eastern Church the unction is the essential matter, though the possibility of Confirmation by imposition of hands is nowadays uniformly admitted. In the Roman Catholic Church the prevalent view is that the unction, together with the imposition of hands immediately connected with it, is the essential matter. East and West mutually recognise the validity of each other's rite; and Latin authorities insist that neither the form nor the matter of Confirmation have been rigidly fixed by divine appointment. Tanquerey (*Syn. Theol. Dogm.* III, para. 468) accepts as probable the opinion that *either* the imposition of hands *or* unction is sufficient for validity, provided the opinion "intelligitur eo sensu quod, pro diversitate temporum et locorum, Ecclesia ritum, generice institutum a Christo, magis specifice determinavit."

As regards the minister. In the East the ordinary minister is the priest using oil consecrated by a Bishop. In the West the ordinary minister is the Bishop, but in extraordinary cases the Sacrament may be administered by a priest if he has received special authority from the Pope for the purpose, but the chrism used in that case must have been consecrated by a Bishop (Canon 781). Benedict XIV, however (in the Bull *Etsi Pastoralis*, 1742), ordered Latin Bishops to confirm unconditionally those in their dioceses who had been baptised by Greek priests, on the ground that these priests had received no authority to confirm from himself or his predecessors, and their confirmations were therefore to be treated as invalid.

(B) *The Inward Part.*

The Eastern Church, joining Confirmation to Baptism in point of time, looks on Confirmation as the complement of Baptism, but nevertheless regards them as two distinct Sacraments. An Orthodox confession (the Catechism of Peter Mogila, quoted in *Confirmation*, Vol. I, p. 291, published by S.P.C.K.) accepted by all the Eastern Patriarchs in 1643, states that " As by Baptism we are regenerated, so by the Holy Unction we are made partakers of the Holy Ghost, being confirmed in the faith of the Lord, and grow in divine grace." Bishop Macarius, *Théologie Dogmatique Orthodoxe*, Vol. II, writes that " in Baptism we are only purified and regenerated by the virtue of the Holy Ghost but are not as yet worthy to receive that Spirit in us and to become His temples."

The Roman Catholic Church, having placed an interval of years between Baptism and Confirmation, declares the special grace of Confirmation to be the gift of the Spirit directed to imparting strength and courage to confess faith in Christ. Latin theologians generally hold that the Holy Spirit is Himself given through all the Sacraments, and there is no one Sacrament to which the gift of the Holy Spirit as such is appropriated. (See Billot, *de Eccl. Sacr.*, Vol. I, Q. LXXII).

An important school of modern Anglo-Catholic theologians differs in some respects from the other authorities of both East and West as to the origin and earliest significance of what came to be known as the Sacrament of Confirmation. These theologians hold that the " Baptism in Holy Spirit " mentioned in Mark i, 8, really means what we now call Confirmation (see C. H. Turner in the *S.P.C.K. Bible Commentary*, ad loc.), that Baptism and Confirmation were originally essential parts of one Sacrament, and that the Fathers, when they speak of Baptism as conferring the gift of the Holy Spirit, really mean not Baptism by itself but Baptism as combined with Confirmation. It was the single initiatory Sacrament of Baptism plus Confirmation which was held to bestow both regeneration and the indwelling presence of the Spirit.*

---

* See, *e.g.* Mason, *The Relation of Confirmation to Baptism.*

(C) *The Necessity of the Sacrament.*

The view of the Anglo-Catholic theologians mentioned above tends to place Confirmation on the same level as Baptism in respect of necessity. Eastern authorities, *e.g.*, Bishop Macarius (*op. cit.*), frequently insist on the indispensability of Confirmation, but it would seem that they do not regard it as necessary to salvation in cases where it cannot be had. Thus in their view the necessity of Confirmation is similar to that which the Latins have defined as *necessitas præcepti* (see below).

The teaching of the Roman Catholic Church on this subject is as follows. Scholastic theology distinguishes two kinds of necessity—(1) necessitas medii, which belongs to everything which is strictly necessary as a means, or is a " sine qua non " to salvation, and (2) necessitas præcepti, which belongs to things which are necessary to salvation because commanded for all and therefore not to be omitted without mortal sin if they can be had, but which nevertheless may be dispensed with without loss of salvation if they are not available, or if a man is ignorant of his obligation in respect of them. Baptism is necessary *necessitate medii* ; the reception of Holy Communion *necessitate præcepti* (though it is held to become necessary *as a means* for long-continued perseverance in a state of salvation). All authorities agree that Confirmation is not necessary in the first sense. Whether it is strictly necessary in the second sense is a point on which different opinions are held. Canon 787 states : Quanquam hoc sacramentum non est de necessitate medii ad salutem, nemini tamen licet, oblata occasione, illud negligere. At the same time it is generally held that a man who has grounds for doubt whether his Confirmation was valid is not *obliged* to be conditionally reconfirmed (Tanquerey, Vol. III, para. 475). And Tanquerey (ibidem para. 477), while himself inclining to the stricter view as more probable, writes : attamen etiam hodie non desunt graves auctores qui . . . teneant omissionem confirmationis non esse peccatum grave præter casus citatos (i.e., where the omission would lead to contempt of the Sacrament, scandal, loss of faith, etc.) : nulla enim exhiberi potest lex divina aut ecclesiastica jubens hoc sacramentum ab omnibus recipi. Exstat tantum præceptum ne quis tonsuram accipiat nisi confirmatus.

(It should be noted that the express rule about the Confirmation even of ordinands seems to date from the Council of Trent, and the medieval practice was more lax.) St. Thomas writes: Quaedam (sacramenta) sunt sine quibus non est salus; quaedam vero sunt, quae cooperantur ad perfectionem salutis. Et hoc modo Confirmatio est de necessitate salutis, quamvis sine ea possit esse salus, dum tamen non praetermittatur ex contemptu sacramenti. *Summa*, Q. 72, Art. I, ad 3.)

Appendix 7

REUNION IN THE MISSION FIELD.

By the Rev. Canon A. W. Davies.

Secretary of the Missionary Council of the Church of England.

"It is the duty of every Christian to labour for unity: yet the foundation of that duty is not in the practical experience of its necessity, but in the longing desire and prayer of our Lord."* This was as true in the First Century of the Church's history as it is to-day. It was the duty of the Church in Jerusalem to seek for and to labour to unite the other sheep that they might be brought into the same fold; nevertheless, it was not until there came from its missionaries the challenge of a new experience that the Church in Jerusalem realised what was involved in the prayer of its Lord, and into what new and uncharted country He was leading His Church. So to-day it is from the mission field that there comes the great challenge to the Home Church.

From almost every field comes the same story: the growing pressure from the so-called younger churches, and a growing demand that the Home Church shall respond to what they feel to be the call of Christ to His Church to-day. It is true that in Japan the movement is not so evident. It is said by some that the fellowship and goodwill which converts find among the Christian denominations are so far in advance of what they have experienced among the Buddhist sects that they do not feel the same need for organic unity as do the Christians of other countries. But in Japan, too, the same spirit is abroad. Committees are at work, and definite schemes are being examined. But omitting the possible exception of Japan, there can be little doubt that there is among the rising Churches of Asia a growing demand for Reunion. The representation of these younger Churches was surprisingly small at Lausanne, but their contribution to

* *Union or Disunion*, by the Bishop of Colombo. P. 10. S.P.G. 1929 Price 3d.

the debates appears profoundly to have influenced the Conference. Of the four paragraphs which make up the Report of the First Section—The Call to Unity—which was unanimously adopted by the full Conference, the longest deals with the situation in the Mission field and contains these words: "More than half the world is waiting for the Gospel. At home and abroad sad multitudes are turning away in bewilderment from the Church because of its corporate feebleness. Our missions count that as a necessity which we are inclined to look on as a luxury. Already the mission field is impatiently revolting from the divisions of the Western Church to make bold adventure for unity in its own right." (*Faith and Order*, p. 261.)*

Again, in the Report of Section V on the Ministry, it is stated that by the differences which have arisen in regard to the ministry "the difficulties of inter-communion have been accentuated to the distress and wounding of faithful souls, while in the mission field, where the Church is fulfilling its primary object to preach the Gospel to every creature, the young Churches find the lack of unity a very serious obstacle to the furtherance of the Gospel." (Ibid., p. 468–9.)

The Report on Section VII, which could not be presented to the full Conference in its final form, states that in the mission field, more than anywhere else, unity is essential. "The demand which comes from the churches of the Mission field is that the churches at home should grant them greater freedom of action, and that their hopes of unity should not be frustrated by the long-continued acquiescence in disunion at home which makes it difficult to recognise how fatal disunion is to the new indigenous churches." (P. 540.)

It has been pointed out that at Lausanne very few nationals of the younger Churches were present. At the Jerusalem Meeting of the International Missionary Council, on the other hand, something like 25 per cent. of the delegates were native members of these Churches. The Meeting did not attempt to deal with the question of Reunion, for it is fundamental to the constitution of the International Missionary Council that it should not do so, yet in its "Report on the Younger and Older Churches" it felt bound to include this

* S.C.M. 1927. Price 10s. 6d.

paragraph : " This statement would be seriously incomplete without reference to the desire which is being expressed with increasing emphasis among the younger churches to eliminate the complexity of the missionary enterprise and to remove the discredit of the Christian name, due to the great numbers of denominations and the diversity and even competition of the missionary agencies now at work in some countries. It is fully recognised that it is not the function of the International Missionary Council to pronounce upon questions of ecclesiastical polity. At the same time, the Council is only performing an inescapable duty when it appeals to the older churches to adopt a sympathetic attitude towards the longings expressed by the younger churches for a more rapid advance in Christian reunion. We appeal also to the older churches to encourage and support the younger churches when, in facing the challenging task of evangelising the non-Christian world, they take steps, according to their ability, to solve what perhaps is the greatest problem of the Universal Church of Christ." (Report of the Jerusalem Meeting of the I.M.C., Vol. 3, p. 215-16.)*

Few as were the actual references to conditions in the mission field at the Lausanne Conference, they were nevertheless striking enough to account for the inclusion in its reports of the passages quoted above. The Rev. Professor T. T. Lew (Congregational Church of China), in his address on the Necessity of Unity for the Missionary Enterprise of the Church, stated that in China " denominationalism . . . has been, and is, a source of confusion, bewilderment, and inefficiency. We recognise also most vividly the crying need of the Christian salvation for China to-day, and we firmly believe that it is only the United Church that can save China, for our task is great and enough strength can only be obtained through solid unity. Therefore, in the name of the Lord who prayed that all may be one, we appeal to all those who love the same Lord to follow his command and be united into one Church, catholic and indivisible, for the salvation of China." (*Faith and Order*, p. 496.)

The Rev. H. Sumitra, a minister of the South India United Church, reminded the Conference that a supplement

**The Relations Between the Younger and Older Churches.* Oxford University Press. 1928.

to the Acts of the Apostles is being enacted in the infant churches of the East: "We believe that in the Church in the mission field the Spirit is revealing to us truths that are perhaps obscure in Christian lands. For example, 'faith' in the mission field means belief in the Lord Jesus Christ and not a statement of this belief. The emphasis on creed and doctrine is conspicuous in the Far East by its absence. All the emphasis is placed on life in Christ, and so far no attempt has been made to define this life in doctrine. As regards the organisation and order of the Church, the Indian Christians have no preferences and no prejudices." (Ibid., p. 421.)

Even stronger was the testimony of Anglican speakers from India. The present Bishop of Tinnevelly, then Head of the Cambridge Mission to Delhi, reminded the Conference of the urgent need of organic unity for the solution of problems of discipline. "Questions of the recognition of caste, particularly in the Holy Communion, of marriage, of semi-idolatrous or undesirable rites and the like are answered differently in different churches, and the result is gravely prejudicial to weak and confused souls. Nothing but a real unity of organ sation can remove this practical difficulty; federation is quite inadequate. A living, growing church needs an organisation by which in one country it can speak with one voice and act authoritatively as one body for the saving of souls." (Ibid., p. 155.)

The Bishop of Colombo, who was not present at Lausanne, in his pamphlet (*Union or Disunion*, S.P.G. 1929) describes the confusion and distress caused by the present disunion in South India and Ceylon. He points out how a member of a family may become a Christian in South India, and another member of the same family in Ceylon. "To them both this is the outstanding fact; they have found Christ, and in finding Him their whole life is transformed. . . At length they meet to share together their great common experience; and now for the first time and to their utter dismay they find they are strangely, mysteriously divided the one from the other. They belong to different bodies. They cannot partake together of holy things. For some reason unknown to them and utterly beyond their comprehension they may not kneel together at the Holy Communion; they cannot

experience their Christian life in the same community. They have left the old unity, which did at least give them a close bond of fellowship ; they have entered into the Body of Christ only to find that when they most need the closest links of fellowship they are divided the one from the other " (p. 8-9).

From the Anglican point of view, the witness of the Indian Bishop of Dornakal at Lausanne must have been the most moving. " Seven Missionary Societies," he said to the Conference, " are at work in my area among a population of a million people, five of which claim the exclusive possession of the Gospel truth and, therefore, the right to enter and plant churches anywhere. Such a multiplication of churches in the same area renders church discipline exceedingly difficult and ineffective." (*Faith and Order*, p. 492.) He claimed that unity is necessary for a common witness before the non-Christian world ; necessary, too, for the very life of the Church in the mission field. Caste in India is ever an insidious peril ; there is always the danger that it may entrench itself behind denominational divisions. On the other hand, the rising tide of Nationalism, if it has not the power to obliterate caste, is, nevertheless, increasingly impatient of divisions imported from without. He ended his address with the following almost passionate outburst : " Fathers and brothers ! Be patient with us if we cannot very wholeheartedly enter into the controversies of either the sixth or the sixteenth centuries. Recollection of these embitters church life ; they may alienate the young Churches from all ecclesiastical connections. Unity may theoretically be a desirable ideal in Europe and America, but it is vital to the life of the Church in the mission field. The divisions of Christendom may be a source of weakness in Christian countries, but in non-Christian lands they are a sin and a scandal."

There is, then, not much room for doubt that in most parts of the mission field, at any rate, the pressure is growing very high. Writing in August, 1929, the Bishop of Persia describes with what difficulty he was keeping the two bodies of Christians in Persia, the Presbyterians of the North and the Anglicans of the South, from " going right ahead." When he explained that he had an oath of canonical obedience to the

Archbishop of Canterbury, some of his own congregation of Persians asked why that should prevent the Persian Church from being united.

The present Bishop of Kangayam, then Bishop of Tinnevelly, spoke grave words at Lausanne. "In the mission field we are actually solving the problems of unity. We in South India, for instance, are drawing nearer to the realisation of a great united Church; but we are hampered by the doubts and difficulties of our leaders at home. Greatly as we respect the authoritative learning of those leaders, we find it hard to reconcile their reluctance to move with the actual facts as we know them at the front. We therefore earnestly ask the home Churches not to strain the loyalty of the mission Churches and of native Christians. If to move forward is dangerous, it is more dangerous to sit still. We also ask that decisions shall not be postponed. Let us not disappoint the Church throughout the world. The Church of Jerusalem took a vast risk when it allied itself with Gentile Christianity; cannot we, also, take risks? God has not given us the spirit of fear, but of power and of love and of a sound mind." (*Faith and Order*, p. 208.)

The evidence that has been adduced emphasises the grievous evil and peril of the present situation. Admittedly it presses the plea of urgency. It has often been said that the Church at home must beware of yielding to the pressure of urgency, that what is needed is calm and balanced judgment. It would seem, however, that more is needed than calm and balanced judgment. Can it not be claimed that there are times when the sense of urgency does not warp but rather release the mind? The Home Church cannot hope to form a sound judgment on the situation in the mission field to-day, nor can it hope to make the adjustments of thought and outlook which may be needed to meet it, unless it can recapture the spirit of a Church going forth on a great adventure under the leadership of a living and present Lord.

Appendix 8

THE PROPOSED SCHEME OF UNION IN SOUTH INDIA.*

STATEMENT OF THE CASE IN FAVOUR OF THE SCHEME.
BY BISHOP E. J. PALMER.

The South Indian Scheme raises questions of two sorts :—

I. The merits of the scheme itself ;

II. The possible effects of the scheme, if carried out, upon other Churches.

I.

On the merits of the scheme the Bishops at Lambeth will naturally consider the principles which either underlie it or seem to be involved in some of its provisions.

(*a*) Of the principles which underlie the scheme, the following are the chief :—

(i) Corporate union alone is desired or aimed at. Federation has been definitely set aside, and so also has the method of dealing with the interim period by restricting every minister to the performance of worship according to the rite of the Church in which he received his ordination. The last-named expedient (it is held) would only stereotype divisions, the disappearance of which it is desired to facilitate. One of the dangers of divisions within Christianity in India is that they may be used to reintroduce and perpetuate Caste-divisions. Consequently, the scheme is a scheme for thoroughgoing corporate unity.

(ii) It is not conceived by the promoters of the scheme that this corporate unity can be achieved in a day, or by any formula of union. It is held that it must gradually be produced by a process of fusion, possibly a long process. Though very little *deep* impression has been made on the Indian mind

* In this and Bishop Gore's Memorandum the scheme referred to is the " Proposed Scheme of Union prepared by the Joint Committee " of the representatives of the three Churches, 1929. Obtainable from S.P.C.K.

by the points of controversy which agitate western Christendom, yet a great deal of difference in practice and custom has resulted from the fact that the missionaries are divided from each other by those controversial points, and have imported practices and customs in accordance with the views and traditions of their home Churches. It would be impossible for the missionaries, and very difficult even for the Indians, to agree at once and before union to a uniformity of practice and custom, even if that were desirable. But if time is given after union, there will be a slow and uncontentious fusion of practice and custom within one body, and it would be wrong to assume that the Holy Spirit will refuse or fail to guide that fusion.

The same remarks apply also to opinion. There are many varieties of views held by and in the uniting Churches. The scheme does not attempt an agreement on the whole of theology or on the whole theory of the Church. The scheme expresses the agreement which exists, and leaves the attainment of further agreement to future generations which will be born in one Church, not in three different Churches, and in circumstances of co-operation and fellowship, not of competition, mutual ignorance and mutual suspicion. It must be noted that the Indian Christians are far more agreed than the missionaries at the present moment, if only because their religious views are simpler and more elementary and they have no use for most of the points which divide the missionaries.

The Bishops of the Lambeth Conference will undoubtedly consider whether the agreements recorded in the scheme are sufficiently important and extensive to afford a starting point for union. The Lambeth Quadrilateral was propounded only as a starting point for negotiations towards union. Conformably with this, it will be found that the South Indian scheme involves not only acceptance of the Quadrilateral, but a measure of agreement extending beyond this, notably in including a much more detailed view of the ministry of the Church and the functions of the different ministers, and in taking over from the uniting Churches a system of councils of certain areas of differing size from the parish to the whole Church which already exist for the development of the life and work of the Church. It is also to be noted that

the uniting Churches agree that their outstanding aim is the conversion of India, and desire unity mainly for the sake of accomplishing that aim.

It has been urged, in opposition to this part of the scheme, that the differences between Protestant and Catholic as seen in England are so great that no union between them is possible. It would be untrue to fact to assume that they are equally great in India. The overpowering desire to get on with the work of the conversion of India minimises those differences even among the missionaries, and they are far less acute among the Indians. It is not safe to argue from England or America to India. But the question that matters is not whether the remaining differences which the basis of union does not pretend to have settled, are so great, that real union between those who hold such different views is humanly impossible. The question is whether the framers of the scheme are right in believing that, if (so far as lies in their power) the South Indian Christians give Jesus Christ that unity of His Body which He desires, He will give them that unity in opinion and practice which they require. The scheme is built on that faith. It cannot be opposed on the ground that Jesus is unable to do this. Is it to be opposed on the ground that the faith of its promoters is foolish or insincere ?

(iii) The next main principle to be considered is that the scheme is a deliberate attempt at union by combination, not by absorption or submission. It assumes that in each of the uniting Churches God sees things of value which belong to His plan for His Universal Church. It attempts to lay hold of those things, and to give each of them their due place and proportionate share in the united Church. Thus, for instance, it attempts to recombine the Episcopal, Presbyterian and Congregationalist elements in Church polity. The Bishops are not likely, in face of the facts of the undivided Church, as well as of the divided portions of Christendom, which are now working in disastrous separation, to hold that any of these elements in Church government is wholly wrong and without meaning or use. The question which they will take up will rather be whether the scheme combines them rightly.

(*a*) All the historic functions of the Bishops are retained.

But most of these are to be exercised with varying degrees of consent obtained or of counsel sought from the other clergy and representative laity of the dioceses. The succession to the functions of the Apostles is thus maintained, and among those functions that of ordination. The " continuity of the historic episcopate " is to be " both initially and subsequently maintained " by adherence to the Nicene rule of consecration. It is not required that any member or minister should believe or teach that this continuity in the episcopate by way of consecration goes back to the Apostles, because, as a matter of fact, many scholars who have studied the question do not think this can be proved, and it is at present firmly held by many Free Churchmen that there is no reason to think that all the first mon-episcopal Bishops owed their position to Apostolic appointment. This is (among scholars) an unsettled question, and the scheme does not demand of the united Church to adopt one or other view. But it does postulate the continuous episcopate so far as it is an undoubted fact of history, and retains its characteristic functions, which the Catholic Church has believed to be Apostolic.

The special duties of the episcopate with regard to faith and doctrine, and worship, and to the membership and ministry of the Church are safeguarded in the same manner as in the National Assembly of the Church of England (VIII.C.7).

(β) The characteristic strength of Presbyterianism—the giving of responsibility for the general advance of the Church to all the clergy and representative and outstanding men of the laity is preserved in the system of councils mentioned above, and can be paralleled from the undivided Church, and is consistent with the ideal of the spirit-filled body. The only modern element here is the use of election in choosing the members of the higher councils. The functions have not been assigned to ordained " ruling elders " as in Presbyterianism, and the scheme has been criticised on the ground that that institution, though founded on a false exegesis of 1 Tim. v. 17, is the most characteristic success of the Presbyterian system. But ample recognition is given to the functions of laymen in the Church, such as are customary both in Presbyterianism and Wesleyanism. The

scheme, however, excludes the characteristic error of Presbyterianism that all ministers are equal, which is incompatible with any theory of several orders of ministers differing in function.

There is nothing in these points which is likely to be criticised from the point of view of inheritors of the Catholic tradition. There may be more hesitation about assigning a place to Congregational conceptions.

(γ) The scheme recognises that a congregation, in the sense of the people of God in a certain place, has an individuality which ought to be respected in much the same way as the individuality of each Christian, though it must not be demanded that the general interest of the whole body should be sacrificed to the freedom of the individual, whether person or congregation. This last-named consideration must greatly diminish that autonomy of each congregation for which originally Independency stood. Many Congregationalists are greatly alarmed at the restrictions of that autonomy which are to be found in the constitution. But it is to be remembered that some of these restrictions are already to be found in the constitution of the South India United Church. Of the four characteristic liberties of a congregation under the principles of Independency, the absolute autonomy of the congregation as such would vanish with the fact of any union, but in this union the congregations belong to a Church which does not merely connect them by means of a Consultative Assembly, as the Congregational Unions of Great Britain or America do, but possesses a supreme governing and legislative body, " the Synod," which is " the final authority in all matters pertaining to that Church " (VIII. C.4a). The second, the independence of a congregation and its minister in regard to statements of belief, is greatly restricted by belonging to a Church which accepts " the Apostles Creed and the Creed commonly called the Nicene, as witnessing to and safeguarding that faith which is continuously confirmed in the spiritual experience of the Church of Christ, and as containing a sufficient statement thereof for a basis of union " (III.A.), and lays down that no authority in the Church may forbid the use of the Creeds in worship, and the Synod may give directions concerning the occasions on which they may appropriately be used (IX.D.), and that

" every person about to be ordained in any diocese of the Church will be required to affirm his sincere belief in the truths witnessed to by the Nicene Creed " (VII. Part 1, D.(3)). The third, the right of a congregation to choose and make a minister for itself, survives only so far as the choice is concerned, but after the choice is made, if the man is not yet ordained, he must pass through training approved by the diocese, be himself approved by the Diocesan Council or some Committee on its behalf, and separately by the Bishop himself, and then be ordained by the Bishop, not by the congregation. The fourth liberty, that of settling its worship as it chooses, is retained by each congregation, subject to the anticipation of a " gradual preparation of some service book or directory of worship which would embody everything in existing forms of worship which is found to be helpful for worship in India, together with such forms of worship as Indian Christianity, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, may devise in the future " (III.E.), and subject also to " any special regulations " under the Constitution " which may hereafter be issued by the Synod." (IX.A.2). The existing practices of worship will continue to be permissible throughout the Church, not only the Congregationalist absence of set forms, but the set forms now in use among the Anglicans and Wesleyans and the optional forms of the S.I.U.C. Directory. Though these traditions will, no doubt, have a considerable influence in moulding the future service book or directory of worship, the general effect is that there will be at the union no *lex orandi* of the United Church.

This constitutes an immensely serious difference from the custom of the Catholic Church for many ages. It is true that all the persons who really want fixed forms of worship will have them, but there will be no body of liturgical forms to which appeal can be made as showing the mind of the Church when it reveals itself in the worship of God. However, it must be observed (*a*) that if an attempt were made now to impose forms of worship on every congregation, there would be practically no recognition of Congregational liberty left anywhere, and (*b*) that the thing most to be desired is that Indians should find their way to natural and congenial forms of worship as the nations of the West did, and that would be

greatly hindered, if not prevented, by prescribing forms at this stage.

The place of the Congregational element in the recombination has been treated here at length, because it is the most difficult to combine with the emphasis on corporate unity which belongs to the Catholic tradition. So far as the printed scheme goes, it is submitted that on this subject nothing has been proposed which gives ground for adverse criticism from the Bishops at Lambeth. Adverse criticism in plenty has come from Congregationalists, both missionaries in India and leading men in England.

(iv) The Anglican negotiators regarded it as justifiable to follow precedents of the undivided church even where the later church has passed away from them or established rules at variance with them. It is argued that this is wrong because evolution never retraces its steps, but to this it is replied that the laws of physical evolution do not necessarily apply to ideas, and in particular to spiritual ideas. It is also urged that when the church has considered its past practices and condemned them the later judgment must be accepted. There seems little reason to assume that second thoughts are best, and the Church of England has never held this about the later thoughts of the Church. Dean Inge ridicules those who propose to return to the precedents of the primitive Church, as people who would like to return to the cradle and the rattle. But the reason of the Anglican negotiators for following this method is indicated by this very gibe. The Indian Church is at the stage of infancy, and, more than that, the circumstances which confront it are very similar to those which confronted the Church of the second century. What the Church found effective in meeting its trials and difficulties then in the countries around the Mediterranean may very likely prove excellent again at the present juncture in India. This is a real and uncontroversial reason why the non-episcopal Churches may feel happy in adopting episcopacy there. This is also a reason why the Anglicans may be inclined to look favourably on proposals which go back to the earliest period of Church history for their precedents. The Church is to be left to find its way again from unliturgical services without obligatory fixed forms to liturgical forms suited to the genius of the country. The Diaconate is con-

templated as a substantive order in which many persons will remain for life, doing work more comparable to that of primitive than that of medieval and modern deacons (VII, Part 1, E. (1)). Candidates for the presbyterate will ordinarily but not necessarily, serve the diaconate first (VII, Part 1, E. (3)). (The last-named provision is only halfway back to the primitive precedent.) Similarly it has been assumed in the negotiations, though it does not appear in the Constitution, that the first consecrations to the episcopate of ministers who now belong to the Churches uniting with us might be *per saltum*. Deaconesses are recognised and so are many kinds of ministrations by persons " set apart " or " authorised " but not admitted to any of the three Orders (VII, Part 2). The scheme returns to the use of the word *presbyter*, and abstains from the use of words corresponding or equivalent to *hiereus* or *sacerdos* for the same reason for which the earliest Christian Church abstained from those words as titles of ministers, *i.e.*, that in India pure religion and spiritual eminence are not connected with the priests of the temples, but rather the reverse. (The European and American Free Churchmen are, of course, also nervous about sacerdotalism). This list does not exhaust the instances of return to primitive precedents.

(v) It is of the essence of this scheme that under it denominationalism or any other kind of sectionalism will gradually fall away. Those who before the union were Anglicans and Wesleyans will cease to be such, just as the Presbyterians and Congregationalists have ceased to be such in the present South India United Church. The conception is comparatively easy for us, because we believe that we are Catholic Christians first and essentially, and English Catholics or Anglicans in the second place and accidentally. It would be absurd for us to try to impose on other nations English ideas, or Anglicanism ; all that we can do is to try to make them Catholic Christians and leave them to give to their Catholic Christianity an Indian or Japanese colouring. It appears to come very hard to some of our friends amongst the English Wesleyans or Congregationalists to distinguish the universal from the particular in the Christianity which they have received and taught. But this must in any case (union or no union) be done in a foreign country, and this very necessity

makes an Indian union easier than a union between the same denominations in England. But it must be carefully borne in mind that there will be no such thing in South India as Anglican churches or clergy, or Wesleyan churches or ministers, after the union—there will be only churches and ministers (or clergy) of the Church of South India.

(*b*) We pass now to principles which do not underlie the scheme, either as motives or as general determinative principles, but which are (or may be thought to be) involved in some of its provisions. For the most part these are connected in different ways with the ministry. The criticism of the scheme is concerned almost entirely with the provisions for the so-called "interim period." It is complained that these provisions imply uncatholic views about the ministry of the Church and the Sacraments. This complaint has importance only if the views which the complainants call catholic are catholic, and are true, and are the only true views on the particular subject. But the purpose of this report is not to determine those questions, but to place in a clear manner before the Bishops at Lambeth the provisions of the scheme, and the views which they necessarily involve.

(i) The scheme provides, as has been already explained, that the Church after union will have the traditional ministry and will maintain the traditional rules of ordination. The Church will guide its own actions by those rules. At the same time it will recognise as ministers of the Word and Sacraments within it (*a*) those ministers who are at the time of union working in one or other of the uniting Churches, and (*b*) such ordained missionaries as may in the 30 years following the union be sent out by the missions now working in any of the uniting Churches, though in both cases they are not ordained by bishops, provided that they will accept the Basis of Union and the Constitution.

Both the rule of the Church and the personal exceptions that it makes represent the facing of facts by the parties to the negotiation. The Free Churchmen have faced the fact of the historic ministry universal in the Church from the second century to the sixteenth, and even to-day extending over seven-tenths of Christendom. Particularly they have become convinced, as they joined in stating in the report of

the first meeting at Bangalore, " that the principle of the historic episcopate in a constitutional form is that which is more likely than any other to promote and preserve the unity of the Church." This corresponds with the judgment of such men as Dr. Garvie and Dr. Bartlet in England, the former of whom writes in *The Reunion of Christendom* (Ed. Sir James Marchant, pub. Cassell, pp. 144–5) : " It must be admitted that the early origin, the long continuity, the wide diffusion of the Episcopate in the Christian Church make it an appropriate, nay the most appropriate, organ for making manifest this universal character of the Christian ministry." " The Congregationalist type " of Church polity " asserts the liberty in Christ of the Christian people ; the presbyteral type the equality of all the ministers of Christ ; the episcopal the authority of the Church as a whole over the parts." This is just where the Free Church missionaries stand. Behind them in India are the Indians who are animated by no inherited hatred of " Prelacy " or suspicion of episcopacy, and are accustomed in their Rajas to the rule of an individual reinforced by religious sanctions. Their attitude was summed up in the words of Mr. Santiago (a leading minister of the S.I.U.C.) at an early meeting of the Joint Committee : " We are going to have episcopacy, and we will have the real thing if we have it at all." But Free Churchmen, whether missionaries or Indians, have no intention of denying the reality or efficacy of non-episcopal ministries and of the sacraments administered by them. The historical ministry, including the episcopate, and the historical rules of ordination are to them *the best way*, which for the sake of unity must be followed. They are not *the only way* in the sense that no other way of providing and carrying on a ministry of the Church has produced the effects that the Church looks for from its ministry.

Simultaneously with this facing of the facts of the historic ministry by the Free Churchmen, the Anglicans have faced the facts of the Free Church ministries. They have not been content to say, " we do not presume to judge what God may think fit to do in the exercise of His uncovenanted mercies." God's actions are meant for us to learn from. And in the matter of union such learning must be attempted because no scheme of union can be made which does not

imply some judgment about all the existing ministries of the uniting Churches. The Anglicans on the Joint Committee have accordingly considered the ministries of the Free Churches and what has happened by their means. They have observed that the Word has been preached by them, that heathen have been converted from darkness to light, and have been taught the duty of communicating the same glorious light to others. They have observed that the two sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper have been celebrated by these ministers with the purpose of obeying the Lord, and of carrying out everything that He is recorded to have commanded (except that some of them have strange ideas about what constitutes wine). The Anglican negotiators also believe that, unless their powers of observation are entirely untrustworthy, sacramental grace is given by God through these ordinances (for in South India the doctrines which inhibit faith in God's action through the Sacraments are not preached). The two things which they lament are that these ministries, being exercised in separate and (in certain ways) competing Churches, emphasise, strengthen and perpetuate the divisions of the Lord's Body, and that they maintain a method of ordination which is not the traditional method of the Church and is manifestly favourable to the making of divisions. But these two lamentable concomitants of the Free Church ministries are both to be removed by their adhesion to the scheme. The Anglican negotiators believe that there have been gifts and calling given by God to these ministers, and the gifts and calling of God are without repentance. They, therefore, in view of the facts thus observed and weighed, are willing to accept these ministers as ministers of the Word and Sacraments in the united Church after union, if they assent to the Constitution and also (VII, Part 1, A (4)) are authorised by a Bishop of the Church to minister in his diocese.

The Anglican negotiators have found the Free Churchmen willing to face one set of facts (that of the historic episcopal ministry) and have themselves faced another set of facts (that of the non-episcopal ministries).

The Bishops of the Lambeth Conference will have to consider whether the conclusions thus reached by the negotiators are right or not. For that purpose it is inevitable that

theories will be considered. It is to the point, therefore, here to consider some of these theories in their relation to the scheme.

(ii) The theory with which the most lively feelings are connected is that which concerns the validity of the Eucharist. It is held by some (*a*) that a Eucharist in order to be valid must be celebrated by a Priest ordained by a Bishop in the Apostolic succession, and (*b*) that an invalid Eucharist is not a Eucharist or even a sacrament at all. For instance, Dr. Darwell Stone stated before the Committee that he thought that if a person not ordained by a Bishop celebrated the Lord's Supper, the service would not be a Eucharist nor a sacrament, but a service of some sort through which God might give grace, but not sacramental grace. It is almost inevitable that a person taking this view will consider that the proposed united Church by permitting the ministers of the non-episcopal uniting Churches to continue to hold communion services in their districts would be giving its sanction to an imposture. The framers of the South India Scheme would hold that Dr. Stone's theory is contrary to the facts as they know them in India, and, moreover, undoubtedly contrary to the facts that can be observed much nearer home in Presbyterian Scotland or Lutheran Germany. It must, therefore, fall to the ground, like all theories that do not fit the facts. It is not held by all those whose views are most similar to Dr. Stone's. Dr. N. P. Williams denies it in almost every particular, as appears from his pamphlet, " Lausanne, Lambeth and South India," (Longmans), p. 33, where, writing of " the great non-episcopalian areas of Christendom," he says, " in the absence of the Apostolic ministry, the Prophetic ministry was, it would seem, justified in taking over the celebration of the Eucharist, inasmuch as the only alternative would have been the impossible one of allowing the Eucharist to lapse altogether. And, as it is unthinkable that God would not respond to the efforts of those who were doing the best they could in abnormal circumstances which were not their fault—and as ' Prophetic ' or non-episcopalian Eucharists have proved to be in fact ' spiritually efficacious '—it is not unreasonable to conclude that, *for those who use them and have no others that they can use*, such celebrations are ' *a priori* reliable.' " (Presum-

ably he disapproves of the interim proposals of the scheme on the ground that such celebrations as those just described "would not be valid for Christians possessing the normal ministry of the Sacraments, which is the Apostolic ministry.") Dr. Gore has always refused to say what happens when all of the conditions of validity, which in his opinion are demanded by the Church, are not present, except that he cannot be sure that in their absence there will be efficacy in the Sacrament. But this view is not in itself fatal to this particular part of the scheme, because such a view cannot be a reason for forbidding persons to receive the Lord's Supper at the hands of a minister not episcopally ordained, who are quite sure that they have received and will receive an efficacious Sacrament under those conditions.

The united Church proposes to treat the views of persons who believe that the Sacraments of ministers not episcopally ordained are either invalid or doubtful as personal views, and assures them that, where they are directly concerned, their conscientious convictions shall not be offended by their having the ministrations of such a minister forced upon them (IV, B. 3). This is logical from the point of view of a Church which holds that, granted right dispositions in the recipients, the Holy Communion celebrated by the non-episcopal ministers (*a*) was efficacious before the union when their people had no access to the historic ministry, and (*b*) will be efficacious after union when those same ministers are authorised by the Bishops who are within the historic ministry. (*a*) Is a position which is in agreement with Dr. N. P. Williams' views quoted above, and is in principle the same as that of Bishops Andrewes and Cosin. It is submitted that (*b*) is consistent with the principle of Ignatius, according to which such a Eucharist will be also valid, as the Bishop of Dornakal has always urged. "Let that be considered a valid (*βεβαία*) Eucharist which is under the Bishop or the person to whom the Bishop commits it." He does not say "or some presbyter to whom the Bishop commits it," nor "or a man who has been ordained by one of the Bishops." Why? Because that was not how the matter presented itself to the great Bishop of Antioch. Perhaps in his diocese numerous prophets celebrated, and all that he had been able to do in the way of bringing them into the diocesan

system was to get them to receive from him commission to celebrate. But even if that conjecture of the exact implication of the phrase be not correct, the phrase is obviously wider than it would have been if the writer had wanted to make clear that only a presbyter could celebrate in the absence of the Bishop. Thus to Ignatius the validity (or whatever he means by *βεβαιότης*) of the Eucharist is guaranteed by the authorisation of the Bishop. It is submitted that the South Indian scheme does not do anything terrible by returning to this precedent, and giving the Bishop power to authorise a man to celebrate after union who with God's blessing has celebrated in separation.

It is true that both the Roman Church and the Orthodox Church hold at the present day, and have long held, that no Eucharist is possible except it be celebrated by a Priest ordained by a Bishop in the apostolic succession. But that does not prove that they are right. It is argued on the other side (*a*) that it is obvious *a priori* that the requirement of a " proper minister " for the Eucharist is only a rule of discipline, and consequently Tertullian is justified in placing the Eucharist and Baptism side by side in this respect, and the other early references (*e.g.*, 1st Council of Nicaea, Canon 18), do not necessarily imply any other view, and (*b*) that the view that failing the proper minister there cannot be a Eucharist is comparatively late (is it demonstrably earlier than Innocent III at the Lateran Council, 1215 ?), and is the sort of thing that priesthoods in all countries have always said in order to enhance their power by emphasising their indispensableness, and (*c*) that there are indications at various dates that the rigid theory was not held, some in the form of the admitted possibility of a true Eucharist without a minister in case of necessity, as in the famous passage of Tertullian or in recorded occurrences in times of war, others in that of celebrations (apart from necessity) by persons deemed to possess other qualifications than episcopal ordination (such as prophets and confessors), and (*d*) that the facts about the Lord's Supper in at least some of the churches of the Reformation cannot be accounted for except on the theory either that God treated them as cases of necessity (the later generations at least being deprived of access to the historic ministry without their fault) or regards the prophetic ministry

as having, either generally or in cases of necessity, authority to celebrate the Eucharist. (See note at end of Memorandum.)

The Bishops at Lambeth will need to take cognisance of these arguments, because it is on this point that the most violent emotions are aroused, and the attempt made by the Lambeth Joint Conference 1925 to negotiate a union in England in such a manner as to avoid the necessity of deciding these points and those referred to in the following section, failed.

(iii) The theories of the ministry and particularly of ordination are held to be involved also in the proposed arrangements for the interim period. Whereas the decision of the united Church is to adopt for itself the historic ministry and the historic rules of ordination, some hold that this is rendered nugatory by the continued employment during the *interim* period of ministers not ordained by Bishops, and possibly longer, and that by this provision Catholic principle is abandoned. But the ground for such an argument is difficult to make good ; it cannot be argued that any rule for the benefit of man is incapable of admitting exceptions (for the well-known arguments of our Lord and of Aristotle are conclusive against this plea) or that *Deus non alligatur sacramentis* does not apply to Orders. The remaining possible argument is that the three Orders of Bishops, Priests and Deacons deriving from Bishops in the apostolical succession are absolutely the *only* orders of ministers in Christ's Church. Such an argument, it would be replied, is not supported by, but rather opposed to, Holy Scripture. The scheme does imply the contrary : it implies that the non-episcopal ministries which are concerned in it are real ministries. It does not enunciate theories, but, if its framers were asked for theories, they would say in brief either that these ministries were raised up by God to meet the necessities of His people who had not access to the normal pastoral ministry of the historic Church, or that they represent the prophetic ministry, which under the New Covenant, as under the Old, has always been a resource which God has in reserve against times in which the persons exercising the normal ministries of the Jewish Priesthood in the one case, or the Christian Three Orders in the other, have failed Him. It is submitted that

some such theory must be found to account for the work done by the ministries of non-episcopal reformed Churches : it is not plausible to regard them as ministries of casual unauthorised laymen. In considering non-episcopal ministries it must be borne in mind that the theories entertained in their Churches are of three types : the Presbyterian holds that both grace and charge are conveyed by ordination, the Wesleyan or Methodist holds that grace is conveyed to a man by God's inward call to the ministry, and increased in response to the prayers of the Church at ordination ; the Congregationalist usually holds that the grace-gift for the ministry is given with the inward call, and only charge is given by ordination which is a recognition of the complete grace-gift. The first two of these theories of ordination are compatible with the words of the last paragraph of IIIa, to which no objection, it is believed, can be raised from the Catholic point of view.

The reasons why the provision about " such exceptions to the general principle of an episcopally ordained ministry " as the permission to the founder-missions to send in ordained missionaries under conditions after union, is not terminated by the constitution after 30 years, are (1) that it is the Church that must and will settle matters of this sort—confessedly exceptions—in accordance with the circumstances which will then exist, and (2) that, if the scheme is right, it would be absurd to lay down that it must not be applied to other churches which might join the union at later dates.

(iv.) The paragraph about admission to communicant status (VI, 5) is said to contain " disparaging language about confirmation." It lays down that " until the Synod of the Church shall frame general rules with regard to full or communicant membership," the existing rules of the uniting churches shall remain in force, and any person admitted to communicant status by any of them shall have that status throughout the Church. The only other reference to confirmation is in VII, Part I, A (12), where it is said that the Bishop cannot delegate his power of confirmation to his commissary. As in other matters where the uniting Churches have not yet attained to agreement, no doctrine about confirmation is stated. The rule of the Church of England which makes confirmation the door to the reception of communion is not Catholic, and the reasonable principle is that persons

should be prepared for admission to that Holy Sacrament, and that this preparation should be the qualification for admission. Incidentally, this preparation is among us given in the preparation for confirmation, but it may be given separately from it as amongst the Romans and the English Free Churches. The Anglicans in India desiring that confirmation shall be accepted as the great gift of God, that it is, are convinced that the best way of attaining that end is not to attempt to force it on the others as a term of union, but to let it win its way by its inherent value as it comes to be known and understood. This may be a mistake, but no theory of confirmation, whether that of the present Anglican and Roman formularies, or that of the primitive Church, that it is the completion of Baptism, or is itself Baptism with the Spirit, is in question.

(v.) Language is sometimes used which implies that the scheme sets aside the authority of the Church, as shown in the principles acted on or enunciated by or in the undivided Church and the Roman and Orthodox Churches. The framers of the Scheme do not admit this accusation. They would urge that the two matters to which alone it can refer, the rule of Episcopal ordination and the rule restricting celebrations of the Holy Communion to Bishops and Priests, are both upheld by the scheme. The scheme is not inconsistent with these rules or with their maintenance, but only with the exaggerated views of them taken by the later Church. On the one hand if the Church anywhere or at any time has held that there is and can be no real ministry outside the ministry of the apostolical succession, this view is an exaggerated view unwarranted by Scripture or fact: it is an unnecessary addition to the true view that the normal ministry of Bishops, Priests and Deacons in the succession is the backbone of the Church. On the other hand, the statement that if the rule restricting celebration of the Holy Communion to Bishops and Priests is on any occasion not observed, there is and can be no celebration of that Sacrament, goes beyond the truth and nature of a disciplinary rule. Such a view might easily grow up when for many centuries the rule was never broken, or be adopted in order to give greater impressiveness to the rule. But to say that the rule is only a rule of discipline is not to set aside the rule or to dispute its obligation.

If, however, anyone wishes to press the point that every principle or doctrine which may be found in the undivided Church and the Roman and Orthodox Churches is necessarily true and necessarily binding on us, it should be observed that the Church of England has condemned this notion in Articles XIX and XXI and illustrated its condemnation of it in Article XXII. The reasons for this condemnation are well known and need not be repeated here.

II

The possible effects of the scheme, if carried out, upon other Churches.

(*a*) Under this heading, the question of inter-communion may be considered first. The Anglicans on the Joint Committee felt that they should refuse to accept union on the condition that they must in consequence of it renounce their communion with the Church of England. They felt that, therefore, they could not demand that condition from the others. The inevitable consequence of these two positions taken together is that the united Church must be in communion with the Churches with which the uniting Churches are in communion. This is anomalous, but not unexampled. The Church of Russia is in communion with the Ecumenical Patriarchate and also with the Church of Bulgaria, but the two last named are not in communion with each other. However, what is really contemplated is ill-described by the terms used in IV, A (1) though they contain a distinction which has been missed. The " full communion " which is sought with the Anglican Communion is regarded as different from " such relations of communion and fellowship with other Churches as are now maintained with those Churches by the South India United Church and the Wesleyan Church in South India." The latter are very vague and indistinct. They mean practically that the S.I.U.C. and Wesleyans regard themselves in some kind of fraternal relationship with other evangelical churches—which, if they thought clearly, they would see to mean that they do not really regard themselves as Churches, but as societies within the universal Church. They say that they will not forfeit their " evangelical catholicity " or become or join an " exclusive Church." The last

phrase means a Church which does not recognise the ministries of other Churches and does not invite " all who love the Lord Jesus in sincerity " to partake of its communions. As a matter of fact they have hardly ever, if ever, received ministers ordained in other Churches than the founder Churches as regular ministers of the S.I.U.C. or of a Wesleyan Church in India, nor do they actually propose to do so. It does mean that the united Church will not forbid ministers to give the general invitation to communion who have always done so, or desire to do so. The scheme treats this as one of the things which must remain for the present to be settled as the Church may see fit. The Anglican Bishops in India already very generally allow persons not belonging to our Church, but communicants in their own Churches and unable to obtain communion from a Church of their own within reasonable distance, to be given it in one of our Churches which is near them. This is now charitable help in spiritual destitution. Under the scheme the same reception to communion will occur under the same circumstances, but for a different reason, viz., that they are admissible as members of a Church with which the other uniting Churches have been on terms of " communion and fellowship." In England on the other hand, the English Church will make its own terms. All that the scheme asks is that those who now could communicate with her will still be allowed to do so, and also those (if any) of the Indian-born members of the united Church who elect to do so. It is assumed that the English-born Wesleyans or Congregationalists will, on returning to England, be Wesleyans or Congregationalists. What the scheme asks about clergy is that those of the clergy of the English Church who wish to work in South India, and are accepted for work there, should be allowed by the Church of England to go to South India and work in the united Church without incurring any censure or penalty from the Church at home, and similarly that Bishops, Priests and Deacons of the South Indian Church be allowed to minister while in England in the Church of England on the same conditions as such ministers of other Churches of the Anglican Communion are allowed to minister. It is not asked that ministers who before the union were ineligible so to be employed should by virtue of the union become employable in the Church of England. The Church of England must make her own rules for England.

If such conditions do not constitute full communion, the section is so far drafted wrong: and probably the phrase needs to be omitted and the actual proposals set out in detail.

(*b*) This being the extent of the request for inter-communion between the Church of South India and the Church of England, and other Churches of the Anglican communion, the question immediately arises whether the last named Churches can grant the request if the Church of South India is organised with the constitution as now proposed. The Lambeth Conference will be called upon to advise on this matter, the Churches themselves to take action on it.

It must be pointed out that, if these Churches decide to take no action, the communion which they now have with the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon will continue with its Southern Province when it forms the proposed union in Southern India, because it cannot be true that to unite with other Churches *ipso facto* dissolves communion. If there is to be a dissolution of communion, it must be formally pronounced.

The question then is whether the scheme of union is such as would justify a formal pronouncement of excommunication of the Church of South India by (for instance) the Church of England.

There appear to be three grounds on which a proposal for such excommunication might be based; (1) the first is that it is of the *esse* of the Church of England that persons in it may be able to hold and teach that "episcopal ordination is of the *esse* of the Church," even though others are unwilling to go beyond saying that it is of the *bene esse*, and therefore that this must also be of the *esse* of all Churches in the Anglican Communion. The Church of England has never promised that persons should be able to hold this opinion. It has actually maintained the rule of episcopal ordination, and left people free to believe and to say what they like about it. The Church of South India proposes to do this also, but, unlike the Church of England since 1661, it proposes to enact that its Bishops shall authorise certain (not all sorts of) ministers who have not been ordained by Bishops to act as ministers of the Word and Sacraments in the Church. Unless Bishop Cosin and others were quite mistaken, such action was taken by Bishops in England in the hundred years between the

Reformation and 1661. But strenuous efforts have been made to disprove this. The question raised, however, is whether such action is incompatible with the idea that episcopal ordination is of the *esse* of the Church. The exact answer appears to be: If that means that there are and cannot be any other ministers in the Church except those constituted by episcopal ordination, then the authorisation of these existing ministers ordained in non-episcopal Churches to be ministers of the Word and Sacraments in the united Church is incompatible with that theory. But in view of the facts of history, that theory seems to be untenable, and has not in fact been maintained by most Anglican authorities. It seems, however, possible to maintain that the episcopal ministry and episcopal ordination are necessary to the Church in order to provide the normal permanent pastoral ministry, and in that sense may be said to be of the *esse* of the Church, but that beside that normal ministry God can raise up, and from time to time has raised up, ministries similar to the prophetic ministry of the Old Covenant, and, recognising this the Bishops can for sufficient reasons (by what is sometimes called " economy ") authorise such ministers to perform at certain times and places some of the functions of the normal pastoral ministry. With a theory of this kind the scheme is not incompatible, and it is submitted that this theory is also not incompatible with holding in a real sense that episcopal ordination is of the *esse* of the Church. For it cannot be more of the *esse* of the Church than the other Sacraments are, and there is little reality in saying *Deus non alligatur sacramentis*, if at the same time the speaker refuses to acknowledge any case in which God has plainly acted apart from them.

But even if it is of the *esse* of the Church of England to allow any of its members to hold or teach that " episcopal ordination is of the *esse* of the Church," it does not follow that it is of the *esse* of the Church of India to do so, unless this is of the *esse* of the whole Catholic Church. Which may be said more simply in the form of *the second ground for excommunicating the Church of South India if organised on the basis of the scheme.*

(2) This ground is that it must be a condition of communion between the Church of England and any other Church that

no one shall be accounted a minister of the Word and Sacraments in that other Church, whether with or without episcopal authorisation, unless he has received episcopal ordination. It is not asked that communion shall be maintained on the basis that the Church of England should receive for ministration in it ministers not episcopally ordained because they are ministers of the Church of Southern India. Why should it refuse to allow, except on pain of excommunication, its priests to minister in that Church, because of the presence therein of some ministers not episcopally ordained? Why should it for that reason forbid its members to receive the Holy Communion in that Church when, in the case under consideration, all the Churches now served by episcopally ordained ministers will still be so served, and pre-eminently the Churches using the English language where alone most members of the Church of England would wish to go? Why should it forbid the Chaplains going out to minister to the Army in India to ask the Bishops of the Church of Southern India to confirm their candidates? These are the practical consequences which would result from a resolution passed by the convocations or the National Assembly declaring the Church of Southern India to be out of communion with it. Would any of them be justified by the interim arrangements proposed? If the Church of England took this line of excommunication, it would be openly declaring that the position taken up by the Anglo-Catholic Bishops of the Church of England in the seventeenth century, and through them by the Church of England itself, towards the Church of Scotland on the restoration of episcopacy in 1610 and 1661 was wrong. These precedents may, of course, be wrong, but the assemblies of the Church of England will need cogent arguments to persuade them that they were wrong.

(3) The third ground for such a policy of excommunication would seem to be that the Church of England must do this in self-defence, because otherwise it will be tainted with heresy in regard to Orders, and never be able to continue negotiations with the Churches of Rome or the Orthodox East for restoration of intercommunion. This argument implies that if one Church enjoys intercommunion with another it becomes responsible for all that it does, even

if it has no control whatever over its legislative or executive authorities. This is a position very difficult to understand, and all the more so as it can hardly be the intention of those who advance it to ask the Orthodox Church as a condition of intercommunion with the Church of England to give up its nine unscriptural grounds of divorce, or the Roman Church to give up (say) the denial of the Cup to the laity.

It is submitted in general on the question of the alleged necessity for a breach of communion, that the Anglican communion is not one centrally governed Church, but a federation of locally autonomous Churches so far as those which are provincially organised are concerned; that these provinces have intercommunion not on terms of complete agreement in all things, but of agreement in things genuinely central; and that the differences which are complained of in the scheme of union with regard to the ministry of persons not ordained by Bishops are reasonable exceptions of a temporary nature to general rules of the Church, the observance of which it is the object of the scheme to secure.

(*c*) There can be no other reasons why persons in the Church of England should leave it because of the proposed action of the Church of India or its Southern Province than those which would make it right to propose that the former should excommunicate the latter. If those are of no force in that regard, neither are they in regard to individuals cutting themselves off from the communion of the English Church. And in any case it would appear reasonable that such actions should not be taken upon the adoption of the scheme, but on its failure to produce the hoped-for results. The Indian Church would ask to be upheld and strengthened while it makes a confessedly hazardous attempt to bring about Christ's Will, and not to be deserted, till time has been given for His marvellous power to produce the unity that the Church needs.

NOTE to I, *b*, ii above. "The famous passage of Tertullian" is de exhortatione castitatis. It is discussed by Dr. Brightman in Swete's *Early History of the Church and Ministry*, p. 397, and by Prof. C. H. Turner in *Theology*, May, 1929, p. 251. The reference in the text is based on their observations.

Appendix 9

THE PROPOSED SCHEME OF UNION IN SOUTH INDIA: COMMENTS ON THESE PROPOSALS BY BISHOP GORE.

Bishop Palmer has stated the case for the acceptance of the Scheme in its present form, or with only a slight change, and to me is allotted the less agreeable task of maintaining that in its present form it cannot be accepted by those who adhere to what can truly be called Catholic tradition. This is a less agreeable task, because, if it be true that it is the mind of Christ that His Church should be one not in spirit only but as a visible society in the world, then it must be distasteful to oppose any honest attempt to realise visible unity. But it will probably be agreed by all that this scheme of union, though it concerns immediately only a certain district in India, will have world-wide consequences, if it be approved—directly, because it will be eagerly adopted in other districts of the Mission Field—indirectly, because it will inevitably affect the general estimate of what the Anglican Church stands for. Indeed, it is to make its appeal for approval to the Lambeth Conference and thus throws direct responsibility upon the whole Anglican Communion. It is necessary, therefore, to scrutinise it carefully.

I

There is no doubt that at the Reformation period the Anglican Church took a line of its own. It accepted the appeal of the Reformation to Scripture behind the existing tradition of the Western Church, which showed manifest signs of exaggeration and corruption; but it was also determined not to break with the tradition which could rightly be called Catholic. It desired to hold together the whole English people so far as they were content to accept the breach with Rome, both the more Catholic-minded of them and the more Protestant-minded. Times have changed and the national Church has become a world-wide communion. But it still retains its characteristic comprehensiveness, which is

at once its glory and also its perpetual embarrassment, when united action is required—as to-day, when proposals for reunion are in the air, whether in one direction or in the other. Thus, for example, this particular proposal for reunion in South India, however sympathetically considered, does present to Catholic-minded Anglicans insuperable obstacles to acceptance in its present form—obstacles which arise chiefly out of that element in the Church tradition which is called the principle of Apostolic Succession in the ministry.

II

That principle to-day is often spoken of with contempt, as if modern historical criticism had shown it to be untenable. I cannot in the space allowed me in this paper attempt to vindicate it in detail, but Bishop Palmer's allusions to it require me to say something about it. For a fuller argument I may refer to quite recent books—Kenneth Mackenzie's *The Case for Episcopacy* (S.P.C.K.), and to Professor N. P William's *Lausanne, Lambeth and South India* (Longmans) : also to my own book *The Church and the Ministry* (Longmans), which had the advantage recently of being corrected and brought up to date by Prof. Cuthbert Turner. This book has the merit at least of producing and discussing at length all the early evidence, and not merely bits of it.

Hardly anyone, I think, could venture to say that from the New Testament alone one could prove that our Lord prescribed for His Church any precise form for Ministry such as the three-fold order of the Catholic Church. But He certainly is there represented as having not only founded (or refounded) the Church, as His organ of action in the world but also as having instituted an authoritative Ministry within His Church in the persons of the Apostles ; which He commissioned to fulfil His own Mission in the world in the power of His own Spirit ; which He endowed with legislative and judicial authority, attaching to this authority a divine sanction ; and which He represented as destined to endure till the end of the world (Matt. 28, 18, 20, Luke 12, 41ff.). Certainly also if there is to be found any evidence of divine guidance in the early history of the Church, it is to be found in the emergence everywhere of the threefold ministry, and the

definition of the functions of bishops, presbyters and deacons, in the sense that bishops only could ordain and complete baptism by the laying on of hands, while the authority to celebrate the Eucharist was extended only to presbyters. This development of the exclusive authority of the threefold ministry and this definition of function occurred universally and almost without controversy, as by an inevitable law; and if the legislative authority granted to the Church with a divine sanction has been exercised in any particular, it would seem to have been exercised in this matter (with some variations in respect of Confirmation). Just as in the matter of doctrine we have a period of centuries during which a considerable variety of hazardous experiments were tried with regard to the person of Christ and the being of God, which were afterwards disallowed by distinct enactments, so it was in the matter of order. There were those, for instance, who claimed that Confessors should be granted the right to absolve the lapsed, or should be reckoned to have the dignity of presbyters, and there were deacons who claimed to celebrate the Eucharist, but these claims were decisively overruled. In the case of doctrinal decisions the Church was not supposed in early days to have authority to legislate except where it could claim the sanction of Scripture. In the case of discipline it exercised much greater freedom. In its legislation about Holy Orders the Church could rightly appeal to the New Testament as to the intention of Christ to institute a perpetual ministry which proceeded in view of "the delay of the end" to propagate itself in various distinct orders. But as to the details of legislation the primitive conception of authority left it free; and in respect of universal and continuous agreement it seems to me that the legislation in respect of Orders is entitled to rank with the decisions of the Ecumenical Councils on credal matters and with the Canon of Scripture. If there are ambiguities in the evidence of the earlier period, previous to the definite enactments about Orders, this is certainly also the case as regards the Canon and the Creed. But the very object of legislation in any continuous society is to set aside certain pretensions which had previously made themselves heard or to restrain certain liberties which had been claimed—to "bind" where a certain group had wished to "loose," or "loose"

where they had desired to " bind." Thus the Church legislated in an exclusive sense, as admitting no sacramental ministry but the one threefold ministry and no assumption of functions by any of the ministers except those allotted to him. All other ministries it refused to ratify—it pronounced them invalid. It is difficult to interpret exactly what Tertullian meant when he claimed for the layman in cases of necessity the right to " offer." (Also the claim is made in a Montanist treatise, when he was up in arms against the " church of the bishops," which had refused the claim of " the church of the spirit.") But assuredly that claim was disallowed.

Before the period of canonical decisions there are no doubt many matters concerning the development of the ministry which are buried in obscurity such as the liturgical rights of the early prophets. But I do not think there is any good evidence that anyone was allowed to assume a liturgical function not committed to him or that any local church was ever allowed to make its own ministry, without reference to any precedent or superior authority. I doubt the interpretation of the Didache in this Congregationalist sense: and I can only regard that obscure document as representing some out-of-the way type of Christianity, which had fallen out of the main stream and came to nothing. I cannot allow it an authority such as attaches to the Acts or the Pastoral Epistles or the letters of Clement or Ignatius which represent the main stream. Again, it may be the case (though I doubt it) that for a while in certain churches the whole body of presbyters held the right to perpetuate the ministry without reference to any higher or external authority: but if this was the case, then, in ordaining ministers, they were only exercising an authority which had been intrusted to them; the episcopate (in the later sense) was in such churches for a while in commission. But this state of things very speedily ceased; and henceforth, under mon-episcopacy, no presbyter could validly exercise the episcopal function. I see throughout no good evidence that the principle of the apostolic succession was not maintained, viz., that all ministerial functions must be exercised only by persons who had received authority to exercise them from those who in the previous generation had the authority to impart it, an authority reaching back

at the last resort to the apostles—the principle to which Clement bears witness. Again, I see no good reason to doubt that the sacramental idea of ordination, viz., that the ministerial gift and authority is imparted only in the rite of the laying on of hands with prayer by one who has received the authority to convey it, was held from the beginning.

The difference between the conception of the apostolic succession in the episcopate which was held in earlier times and that which came slowly to acceptance in the West under the authority of St. Augustine (but never in the East) is very important and has been rightly emphasised by Professor Turner. But he has never suggested that the due succession to the see was ever a *substitute* for the sacramental rite of laying on of hands—which dates back to apostolic days, and is always assumed, if (as with us) rarely mentioned. We may well doubt whether the Augustinian doctrine which isolated the sacramental act by the proper minister, as alone constituting a valid ordination, without any reference to its ecclesiastical conditions, was a wise simplification. Morinus says truly that the Easterns who refused the simplification *magis moraliter et civiliter philosophati sunt*. We may wish that the Anglican authorities in the 16th century had followed the lead of the East in this matter rather than the West. But to do so would not have minimised the importance of the sacramental act by the proper minister, and in fact they took over the Western tradition unmodified.

III.

There is no need to discuss the abstract question whether the Church in England might have modified the Western tradition about valid ordinations without losing its claim to catholicity or the bearing upon this question of the Articles of Religion xix, xx, xxi and xxiv, for, in fact, all that the Church of England did was to formulate a distinct and exclusive requirement in the Preface to the Services of Ordination that all its officers should have been ordained by a bishop with rites which, judged by standards which can fairly be called Catholic, are certainly adequate. In the seventeenth century (in 1610 and 1661) it embarked on two perilous enterprises with a view to reintroducing episcopacy into Presbyterian Scotland. In so far as these attempts involved

accepting Presbyterian clergymen without episcopal ordination for an indefinite period they may be quoted as a precedent for a part of the South Indian Scheme. But, in fact, they proved disastrous failures, and immediately after the last of them the restored Church repeated its exclusive requirement for episcopal ordination, making it a little more emphatic by expressly exempting from reordination those who had formerly been consecrated or ordained by a bishop. And I do not know that any exception to the observance of this rule has been recorded from that day to this during all the period of the expansion of Anglicanism into a world-wide federation. Thus the Preface to the Ordinal has been one of the foundation stones of the Churchmanship of High Churchmen or Tractarians or Anglo-Catholics (by whatever name they are called) in company with the sacramental conclusion of the Catechism, and the formulas for the absolution of Penitents and the ordination of Priests, and the statements guarding the indissolubility of marriage, and the last rubric after the Confirmation service. It is not too much to say that the presence of these features in the Prayer Book constitutes a kind of compact on the part of the Church with Catholic-minded persons, just as the passages about the limitation imposed on dogmatic requirements by the necessity for scriptural proofs has been the bulwark against Papalism. There is no doubt that to modify the exclusive requirement of episcopal ordination would be felt by High Churchmen as a breach of contract and would fundamentally alter the status of Anglicanism in the estimation of the Catholic world.

IV.

I confess that I find Bishop Palmer's pleadings against exclusiveness in our claim for the Episcopate rather naïve. Its essence is exclusiveness. For it is not a claim based upon general expediency, but upon a conviction that the Founder of the Church instituted a self-perpetuating ministry within this society and that the ministry of the Catholic Church alone is that ministry. But certainly this maintenance of a principle is supported by the experience that human nature is very disruptive and that the most effective method to combat this disruptiveness and to maintain unity

is that all Christian people should have been made to feel that to belong to the family of Christ means to adhere to the apostolic ministry and to receive the sacraments at its hand. That the Church failed to maintain the unity at critical epochs, as in the fifth century and in the eleventh and in the sixteenth, is lamentably true and the reason why it failed stares us in the face. It was that the counter ambitions of the great sees tore the Church apart, or that the flock could not recognise Christ in its appointed pastors. We cannot wonder, when we consider the background of the Reformation, that the rebellion against the hierarchy should have been what it was. Nor can we wonder that the fruits of the Spirit should have been so manifest in the ministries of the separated Churches. *Deus non alligatur sacramentis suis* has received the widest illustration. We rejoice to acknowledge to the full all that God has done through their prophetic and their sacramental ministry. To refuse this recognition would be something like blaspheming against the Holy Ghost. But I would remind those who use this current phrase as an argument that God has disproved the Catholic theory of the Ministry—I would remind them that there has often been appended to it an antithetic clause *Nos autem alligamur!* The lesson that God is not bound by any ordinances is, it seems to me, not the only lesson which we must learn from the Reformation and its consequences. Is it too much to say that the history of the Reformed Churches on the Continent is a disastrous history? Is not Dr. Heiler justified in crying out for a Reformation of the Reformation? Has it not let loose in England and America the very spirit of disruption? We cannot but feel that there was something deeply wrong in the Reformation movement. Is it possible to imagine that any real union or permanent union can take place among Christians without a recognition of this lesson of experience? I do not want to ask members of purely Protestant Churches to abandon any measure of conviction that God has been working by His Spirit in them or through their ministers; but I do want them to feel that there was some deep flaw in the fundamental conceptions of the Reformation movements. Following on this I do not want them to return to Mediævalism or Prelacy or English Erastianism, but I do desire that they should consider whether

the fundamental ideas and organisation of Catholicism at its best do not provide the best response to human needs and have not in them a compelling authority. At any rate speaking for those with whom I am in the habit of thinking, we feel that we must sternly refuse to suffer Anglicanism to lose its power of appeal to the Catholic tradition about Holy Orders.

V.

Now I come to the details of the South Indian Scheme. We are thoroughly familiar with it, so that I need not describe it again. Also I will not express again the satisfaction which every sincere Churchman must feel at the acceptance which it embodies of what is called " the Lambeth quadrilateral " in a general sense. I will confine myself to the less agreeable task of pointing out the elements in the proposed settlement which, in common with other Catholic-minded people, I find such as imperatively to require modification, if the scheme is to be made acceptable.

Passing over then the " Interim period " and coming to the ultimate arrangements, it is necessary that the clause (Section iv, B.6 " After the period of thirty years, the united Church will consider and decide the question of such exceptions to the general principle of an episcopally ordained ministry,") should vanish, and the intention and rule should be clearly expressed that after the end of the interim period all the ministers of the united church shall be bishops, presbyters or deacons who have received episcopal consecration or ordination, and shall observe the limitation of functions proper to their respective ministries. By all means let us recognise that Presbyterianism and Congregationalism have represented in their systems true principles concerning presbyters and laity which may well be embodied in an episcopal church, free from the reproach of prelatic autocracy. But the system must be (to use the obnoxious word) exclusively episcopalian. It is idle to plead that men cannot bind the action of their successors thirty years on. No, we cannot prevent Congregationalists of the twenty-first century from embracing popery or Anglicans from embracing Congregationalism. But then they would alter their fundamental status and system. What we can do is to establish a system which we intend to be permanent.

It will follow that the South Indian Church of the future, though it will be in full communion with the Anglican Church, and with whatever other Churches Anglicans are then in communion with, cannot be in full communion with Churches which remain Presbyterian and Congregationalist; for their ministers cannot be received as ministers of the United Church without receiving episcopal ordination. I only specify this single point; and it is necessary to speak plainly.

I must add that there must be an unambiguous declaration that episcopal confirmation must be the rule of the settled Church, whatever gradual approach to this rule may be acquiesced in during the thirty years interim. We may regret that the Anglican Church did not continue the use of Unction in confirmation, but it certainly went back to the primitive and apostolic rule for confirmation, as the completion of Baptism, by the laying on of the bishop's hands—a rule with which both East and West had played (as we may say) rather fast and loose—and we must regard confirmation as an apostolic institution with which it is not in the Church's power to dispense.

I come now to the interim period. We must ask for a clear understanding that the union is not effected till this period is over. It is only in process of being effected. Thus we must renew the requirement of the General Council of the Church of England in India of a " proviso that no non-episcopally ordained minister shall either temporarily or permanently be placed in charge of a congregation accustomed to an episcopally ordained minister " (with a corresponding proviso on the other side). Bishop Palmer has told us that the Anglican representatives did their duty so far as to press this requirement upon the other representatives on the negotiating Committee, but that it was refused on the ground that it would be tyranny, if an episcopal congregation wanted a non-episcopal minister, to refuse them permission to have one. They thus definitely contemplated the occurrence of what the General Council definitely desired to prevent. Our representatives thereupon agreed to substitute for the proviso a friendly understanding. But an understanding which definitely refuses to become an undertaking is not a basis on which it is safe to build. I

suppose any congregation in any part of the world which determines to change its status can have liberty to do so. But so long as it remains what it was, it must abide by the laws of its original status ; and an Anglican congregation can have only an episcopal minister. But, going beyond this, there must be a general recognition that there is no accomplished union during the interim period but only an approximation. I do not think that the non-episcopalian congregations can during the interim period be under the supervision or authority of the bishop of their district. He cannot be asked to take responsibility for their services or methods. As ordinations are all to be made by the bishops from the beginning of the interim period, more and more congregations would pass into his charge, and the responsibility for them would become his. But till the end of the period distinct churches with distinct allegiances will remain and full intercommunion would not be reached. All this brings us back to the most fundamental requirement. Let it be agreed that no disowning of the validity of their previous ministries is to be asked of those who are accepting episcopacy as the future rule of their church. On the other hand, there must be no recognition required on the part of the Anglicans that non-episcopal ordinations are valid. Anglicans who hold Catholic principles, and the Church which maintains the " comprehensive " Anglican tradition, cannot be asked to assent to the general statement (see iii B i) " that all the other ministers (other than the bishops, that is) of the uniting churches in the area of the union shall be acknowledged as ministers of the word and of the sacraments in the united Church, each retaining the standing (whether as a minister authorised to celebrate the Holy Communion, or as a deacon or probationer), which he had before union in his own church." No doubt the Anglican Church requires of its members no acceptance of the principle of validity which the statement seems to contravene, but equally it has made careful provision that its members shall not be required to repudiate it. Nothing like this clause, then, must appear in a document which the Anglican Church is to accept and to which it is to agree.

There are other points in the scheme which must cause anxiety to Catholic consciences ; but I have thought it best

to single out those only which seem imperatively to require alteration. It would be practicable no doubt to produce an alternative scheme which should embody these alterations, and which would not to the less attentive reader appear to be very different from the Committee's scheme. But that they would naturally resent. We must confine ourselves to examination and criticism of the scheme as it stands.

VI.

I have heartily disliked my task. Bishop Palmer, with his acquired knowledge of the South Indian district, can speak for what it needs, and can be expected to welcome, as I can not. And his optimism as to the issue of what he calls "a confessedly hazardous attempt" may be justifiable. There are others who know the district as well as he who take quite an opposite view. I cannot judge. I can only speak from the point of view of a member of the Anglican communion who, in spite of all discouragement, and in spite of the excessive disorder which at present prevails among us, believes that it is of vast importance that the "Anglican comprehensiveness" shall be maintained in being—that the Western world should not be left to the dilemma between Romanism and Protestantism as the only alternatives. I cannot conceal from myself that the acceptance of this scheme would go far to break up the Anglican communion. Disruption is much more possible in the outlying regions of Anglicanism than in its home centre. Overseas we have what we have not at home—what I may call "monochrome" dioceses or monochrome groups of dioceses, often immediately juxtaposed. I feel certain, and on good grounds, that the approval of this scheme by the Lambeth Conference would cause it to be adopted by dioceses abroad of exclusively evangelical sympathies, and that this would be followed by its uncompromising rejection by those of exclusively Catholic sympathies. This would very easily lead to actual disruption and breach of communion, which again would spread backward in its effects to the respectively sympathetic parties at home. It is also (to me) impossible to doubt that the status of Anglicanism, as non-Roman but Catholic, in the mind of the Orthodox Churches, and of the Old Catholics

of Holland and elsewhere, would be definitely altered, as would the mind of by far the larger section of the Syrian Church, who are neighbours to the South Indian communities whose future we have been considering. I need go no further in suggesting consequences. They are sufficiently grave.

Appendix 10

NOTES ON THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY AND THE THEORY OF ORDERS

By the Rt. Rev. The Bishop of Gloucester.

1. The Church of England.

The teaching of the Church of England on the Christian ministry is contained in the Ordinal and in the Thirty-nine Articles.

In the Ordinal it is stated : " It is evident unto all men diligently reading holy Scripture and ancient Authors that from the Apostles' time there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church : Bishops, Priests and Deacons. Which offices were evermore had in such reverend Estimation, that no man might presume to execute any of them, except he were first called, tried, examined and known to have such qualities as are requisite for the same ; and also by publick Prayer with Imposition of Hands, were approved, and admitted thereunto by lawful Authority. And therefore, to the intent that these Orders may be continued, and reverently used and esteemed in the Church of England, no man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful Bishop, Priest or Deacon in the Church of England, or suffered to execute any of the said Functions, except he be called, tried, examined, and admitted thereunto, according to the Form hereafter following, or hath had formerly Episcopal Consecration or Ordination."

In the form in which these words are first given in the Ordinal of 1550 the later portion runs as follows :—

" And therefore to the intent these orders should be continued and reverently used and esteemed in this Church of England, it is requisite, that no man (not being at this present Bishop, Priest nor Deacon) shall execute any of them, except he be called, tried, examined and admitted, according to the form hereafter following."

It has been maintained that there is no substantial difference between these two. That cannot be seriously held. The earlier form says that no one shall hold office unless he has

been ordained according to the Ordinal, or has been previously ordained. The latter says that the previous ordination must be episcopal. Up to the year 1660 there is quite sufficient evidence, as is pointed out below, that it was considered possible that one not in episcopal orders could hold office as a Priest in the Church of England. This is sufficient to show that while the Church of England was quite determined and always has been quite determined that it should preserve the historical orders of the Church, it was not prepared to condemn orders which were not episcopal.

In the later form it is to be noticed that special emphasis is laid on the fact that this rule is to apply to the Church of England. " No one shall *be accounted or taken to be a lawful* Bishop, Priest or Deacon *in the Church of England*." The words underlined were added in 1661 and show that although the rule is made absolute that in the Church of England a minister must be episcopally ordained, it is not intended by this rule to pass a judgment on any other church. The rule of the Church of England is for itself alone and it passes no judgment, positive or negative, on any other church.

This point of view is strengthened by the language of the twenty-third Article : *Of Ministering in the Congregation*. " It is not lawful for any man to take upon him the office of public preaching, or ministering the Sacraments in the Congregation, before he be lawfully called and sent to execute the same. And these we ought to judge lawfully called and sent, which be chosen and called to this work by men who have public authority given unto them in the Congregation, to call and send Ministers into the Lord's vineyard."

This Article comes from the unpublished Articles of 1538 which were drawn up by a joint Committee of Anglican and Lutheran divines, and it ultimately derives from the Confession of Augsburg. The fact that it was agreed upon by Anglicans and Lutherans shows that the intention was to affirm the principle that to exercise a ministry duly required the authority of the Church and that it is the authority of the Church which gives validity to a ministry. It was designed definitely to leave the question open who were those " who have public authority given unto them in the Congregation, to call and send into the Lord's vineyard." Then in the thirty-sixth Article it is made plain by the acceptance of the

Ordinal that for the Church of England the proper persons are Bishops. But although this is asserted for the Church of England, it is not asserted in such a way as to condemn ministries which are not episcopal. The teaching of the Church of England here is :—

1. That a lawful ministry must be appointed with the authority of the Church.

2. That it is the authority of the Church which makes a ministry lawful.

3. That for the Church of England this means Episcopal consecration and ordination.

4. That nothing is said condemning any other ministries which are appointed with the authority of the Church.

2. Anglo-Catholic Theologians.

These conclusions are corroborated by a study of the Anglo-Catholic theologians of the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries.*

Although they vary a good deal in their emphasis, and in their theoretical outlook, there is a wide, if not quite unanimous, agreement on the following points :—

(1) They all assert and defend the rightness of Episcopacy and Episcopal ordination. The evidence starts with Jewel and Whitgift. It is continuous, and I think it is not necessary to quote passages in its favour.

(2) At the same time they are not prepared to condemn the orders of foreign Protestant Churches or to say that orders can only be given by a Bishop. For example, in the Seventh Book of the Ecclesiastical Polity ascribed to Hooker, it is said : " Whereas hereupon some do infer that no ordination can stand but only such as is made by bishops which have had their ordination likewise by other bishops before them, till we come to the very apostles of Christ Himself . . . to this we answer that there may be sometimes very just and sufficient reason to allow ordination made without a bishop. The whole church visible being the true original subject of all power, it hath not ordinarily allowed any other than bishops alone to ordain : howbeit as the ordinary course is ordinarily

* The extracts quoted are taken from Mason's *The Church of England and Episcopacy* and Hunkin's *Episcopal Ordination and Confirmation in Relation to Inter-communion and Re-union.*

in all things to be observed, so it may be in some cases not unnecessary that we decline from the ordinary ways." (Book VII, xiv, 11.) The importance of this passage (whether it comes from Hooker or not) is that it recognises that the ultimate authority is (as the Article clearly states) that of the Church.

So again Field is prepared in emergency to admit ordination by Presbyters (although he is a strong defender of the rule of the Church of England) : " But seeing bishops and presbyters are in the power of order the same ; as when the bishops of a whole church or country fall from the faith, or consent to them that do so, the care of the church is devolved to the presbyters remaining catholic ; and as in the case of necessity they may do all things regularly reserved to bishops only ; . . . so in case of general defect of the bishops of a whole country refusing to ordain any but such as shall consent to their heresies, when there appeareth no hope of remedy from other parts of the church, the presbyters may choose out one among themselves to be chief and to add others to their numbers by the imposition of his and their hands."

Andrewes again was prepared to admit Presbyterian ordination, although an irregularity. " Nec tamen si nostra (forma) divini juris sit inde sequitur vel quod sine ea salus non sit, vel quod stare non possit ecclesia. Cæcus sit qui non videat stantes sine ea ecclesias. Ferreus sit qui salutem eis neget."

More testimonies may be quoted, but it may generally be asserted (although there is a certain amount of hesitancy apparent) that the great majority of Anglo-Catholic theologians of this period are prepared to look upon the orders of foreign churches as defective indeed but not invalid.

(3) It was considered possible for those not episcopally ordained to hold office in the Church of England. The following statement is made by Keble in his preface to Hooker's works : " Nearly up to the time when Hooker wrote (1594) numbers had been admitted to the ministry of the Church of England, with no better than Presbyterian ordination : and it appears by Travers' supplication to the Council that such was the construction not uncommonly put upon the statute of the 13th of Elizabeth permitting those who had received orders in any other form than that of the English

Service Book on giving certain securities to exercise their calling in England."

To what extent this practice prevailed is very much a matter of controversy and the recorded instances are contested. It is sufficient for our purpose that it was clearly held by many that this was possible. For example, Bishop Overall is represented as saying to De Laune, "Yet for mine own part if you will adventure the orders that you have, I will admit your presentation and give you institution into the living howsoever."

(4) It was a common custom to communicate with foreign reformed Churches. Crackenthorpe, for example, who defended the Church of England, and claimed for it the title of Catholic, glories in the fact that the English Church communicates with foreign Churches. It is well known also that Cosin and many of those who with him took refuge on the Continent communicated with the reformed Churches.

(5) Twice in attempting union with the Church of Scotland and the introduction of Episcopacy, no attempt was made to re-ordain those in Presbyterian orders.

It is quite irrelevant to dwell on the fact that these attempts at introducing Episcopacy into Scotland were unsuccessful. The question of success or failure has nothing to do with it. The causes of the failure were quite different. They arose from the attempt that was made to force Episcopacy on an unwilling Church. What we are concerned with is the question what theory of orders was held by English theologians and the Church of England, and the answer must be that they held no theory which would make such action impossible even if it was looked upon as irregular.

Now it is not maintained that the Church of England has ever weakened on the necessity of Episcopacy. It has never done so. Nor that it has thought ordination by presbyters normally right. What these facts prove is that it has never held any theory of orders which makes it impossible for it to recognise as ordained ministers those who had only received Presbyterian orders, if a need for it arose.

3. The Theory of Apostolic Succession.

Although the Church of England has never committed itself to any theory of the ministry which has denied the

spiritual value of non-episcopal orders that is not true of a section of the English Church, which has held a doctrine of Apostolical Succession which has definitely denied not only the regularity and validity but even the spiritual value of such orders, and has asserted that the sacraments administered in non-episcopal churches are not sacraments at all.

The doctrine of Apostolic Succession has been held in the Church of England ever since the Reformation, but many of those who have held it have not therefore considered it necessary to deny Presbyterian ordination, for instance, Usher, who clearly teaches a doctrine of Apostolical Succession, writes, " I have ever declared my opinion to be that *Episcopus et Presbyter gradu tantum differunt, non ordine*, and consequently that in places where bishops cannot be had, the ordination of presbyters standeth valid. Yet, on the other hand, while holding as I do, that a bishop hath a superiority in degree over a presbyter, you may easily judge that the ordination made by such presbyters as have severed themselves from those bishops unto whom they had sworn canonical obedience cannot possibly by me be excused from being schismatical."

Further evidence of this need not be given. On the other hand, from the Restoration onwards there has been a party in the Church who have held that valid orders depend upon the Apostolical Succession and that the orders and sacraments of those Churches which have not bishops are not valid and cannot be made so. As to their spiritual value they may have had some difference of opinion. The change in attitude was largely due to the events of the Civil War when an attempt had been made to condemn Episcopacy altogether and to substitute Presbyterianism. So long as it was a question of holding its own position in not too rigid a way, the Church of England exercised a considerable amount of charity and economy towards those without episcopal orders ; the events of the Civil War changed the outlook of many English theologians and since then the attitude has been more rigid.

When we come to examine the doctrine of Apostolical Succession we find that the same term is used to cover a considerable variety of meanings.

The dogmatic theory of Apostolical Succession is well expressed by Bishop Beveridge :—" The apostolical office has been handed down from one to another ever since the apostles' days to our time, and so will be to the end of the world, Christ Himself being continually present at such imposition of hands, thereby transferring the same spirit, which He had first breathed into the apostles, upon others successively after them, as really as He was present with the apostles themselves when He first breathed it into them. Insomuch that they who are thus ordained are said to be made bishops by the Holy Ghost himself, as well as the Apostles were. By which means the holy catholic church always hath been and still is truly apostolical as it is called in the Nicene creed. And the several parts of the apostolical office are now as effectually performed by their successors, and others ordained under them, as they were while the Apostles themselves lived."

There seems to be some difference of opinion as to what is handed down from one to another in the Apostolical Succession. It has generally been held that it is the grace of orders, but there is a tendency now to emphasise rather the idea of jurisdiction and of apostolic authority. The former has sometimes been popularly expressed by the idea of a channel. This goes back apparently to the following passage of Mason (1613) :—" Christ himself is the author of our orders from whom the power of ordaining others, flowing as from a pure fountain, first to the apostles, next, from the apostles, ran down to the bishops as its conduit-pipes ; who at first being golden, and afterwards silver at length, as the metal was debased and corrupted became in some measure leaden. The orders therefore which at first were clear as crystal . . . became thick and muddy, and so came down to Cranmer."

It now remains to examine the validity of this theory. It has been maintained that the Apostolical Succession is taught by the primitive Church, and a long catena of passages can be quoted in its favour, but when these are examined it is clear that they do not mean succession in the sense quoted above. Succession may be of two kinds, succession in office and succession by ordination. The former is represented by the regular succession of kings succeeding one another on the throne of a country. Each king is duly and properly ap-

pointed and, it may be, consecrated in accordance with the custom of the country. He succeeds in a legal manner to the office and the succession of kings preserves the continuity of the traditions of the country. The succession by ordination means that each bishop is consecrated by bishops before him and that in that consecration he receives, by transmission from those who consecrated him, spiritual power and authority.

Now at any rate normally the former represents the Apostolical Succession taught by the early Fathers. They appealed to the open succession of bishops in Rome and in the other great sees of Christendom who had handed down the open and orthodox Christian tradition as against the secret traditions alleged by the Gnostics. What had been handed down had not been episcopal grace or the power of ordaining, but the apostolic tradition of divine truth, the " charisma veritatis " as it is called.

What then in the primitive Church were the conditions necessary for a valid ordination ?

It was primarily the assent of the Church given by all the proper authorities. Cyprian, for example, tells us that " Cornelius was made bishop by the judgment of God, and of his Christ, by the testimony of almost all the clergy, by the suffrage of the people who were present, and by the assembly of priests and good men," and he adds that he cannot have the ordination of the Church who does not hold the unity of the Church. The ordination is as is here stated the ordination of the Church, it is performed according to the form and custom of the Church, and by those officials who had been appointed for the purpose. The gift of the Holy Spirit is given by the laying on of hands in response to the prayers offered up by the Church.

As regards succession by ordination, the point to be noted is that there is no evidence that it was held either by the Church or by any theologian until a later date. The jurisdiction and authority of a bishop depended upon the authority of the Church given by the Church in the authorised way, the spiritual power came through the sacramental rite, but nothing is ever said of either authority or jurisdiction coming by succession from the Apostles.

Those who defend the opposite view never attempt to prove their theory. They assume it and then attempt to

explain away the many facts in the history of the early Church which conflict with it.

If this account of the growth and development of the Christian ministry be correct the following deductions may be made :—

(1) It is not correct to say that the validity of the Christian ministry depends on the Apostolic Succession. It is correct to say that the historical fact of Apostolic Succession which is something of real value, depends upon a valid ministry.

(2) The validity of a ministry depends upon the authority of the Church. In the present divided state of the Church Christianity, each separate Church gives authority over its own ministry for itself and may recognise the ministry of any other Church. A fully valid ministry can come only through the authority of a united Church. All ministries are at present imperfect.

(3) A Church may for the purpose of re-union declare as valid the ministries of other Churches which it may believe have been conferred in irregular fashion.

(4) It is not possible to hold that the spiritual value or efficiency of a sacrament depend upon the form or nature of ordination for the Christian ministry. We believe that the spiritual gifts of a sacrament depend upon the fact that the Lord Jesus Christ is the minister of every sacrament, and we cannot believe that He would cease to be the minister for any body of Christians, however humble and unimportant, who sincerely and earnestly attempted to fulfil His commands and were doing what He had bidden them to do. That need not mean that each Church and the Catholic Church as a whole ought not to guard carefully the regularity of sacraments by laying down the methods for rightly fulfilling our Lord's commands or that it is not right that all Churches should conform to a common rule.

4. The Historical Episcopate.

The Lambeth Conference has demanded the historic episcopate as the basis of reunion, and this has been generally accepted by the Lausanne conference as the basis of Christian union. It is therefore important that a statement should be made of what is implied by the historic episcopate and the reasons for accepting it.

(1) The rule of the Christian Church, at any rate from the beginning of the second century onwards, has been that the ministry should consist of Bishops, Presbyters or Priests and Deacons.

(2) In a fully organised Church each of these officers has his proper rights and duties. The Bishop, however he may be appointed, should be representative of the Diocese, and the Presbyters and the laity have each their own constitutional position.

To take an instance, the local Church is presented to us in the writings of Cyprian as governed by a bishop sitting with the College of Presbyters and the right of the laity to agree to or reject what is presented to them is fully recognised. The universal Church is governed by the assembly of bishops, but what they decide must be accepted by the local church.

A series of courts or councils as organised by the modern Presbyterian Church with the local Presbyter as Moderator of the local church, the Bishop as Moderator of the Diocesan Church Council or Synod, and a General Assembly consisting of Bishops, Presbyters and representatives of the laity, combining the modern Episcopal and Presbyterian systems, would rightly represent a constitutional Episcopate.

(3) The Christian Church has always recognised the autonomy of the Diocese within certain limits. The decrees of any council are not considered binding until they have been accepted by each diocese independently, and it is right that a certain autonomy (as is the case in the Church of England at the present day) should, subject to Catholic or general rule and tradition, be granted to each parish or local congregation.

(4) The right method of the appointment of a Bishop is that the Bishop, duly and canonically elected by the diocese, should be consecrated to his office by three other bishops at least, who have been themselves canonically consecrated.

(5) The right method for the ordination of a Priest or Presbyter is that he should be ordained by the laying on of hands of a Bishop and Presbyters.

(6) The rite of consecration and ordination are sacramental in character—that is, the Holy Spirit is, as we believe, given in response to the prayers of the Church. It has always been the belief of the Church that our Lord Jesus Christ is

Himself the minister in every Sacrament, and that it is He who ordains. As Saint Augustine said, " It is He who baptiseth."

(7) We believe that this traditional and authoritative system of Church government is necessary for a united Church because it is the only form of Church government which has the authority of the Church, and because it alone will create a strong corporate union which will make the united Church an effective force in the world, and because it combines in an effective way the elements of authority and democratic control.

We see these two elements of authority and democracy in the Church of the first centuries, and we believe that the troubles of the mediæval Church and the Reformation arose because the Church had lost its democratic element and that the divisions of Christianity since the Reformation have been due to the loss of the tradition of authority.

(8) The difficulty about any reunion lies in the fact that there is no objective standard of validity or regularity of orders, and each Church has made its own rules. When the Church of England unites with other Churches it is necessary that they should agree on a common rule of order. When the Churches are episcopal there should be no mutual examination of the validity of orders, but it should be agreed that a bishop from each Church which is joining in the union should take part in every consecration until the orders are unified, and if some of the Churches are not episcopally governed, the Presbyters from the uniting Churches should be associated in consecrations and ordinations.

(9) It has become abundantly clear that no proposal for any form of re-ordination will be accepted, whether it be mutual or conditional, as it is felt that such a re-ordination would be entirely unreal or would imply the invalidity of previous orders. The Church should, in the exercise of the power which is inherent in it, recognise the orders of all uniting Churches, but for such a period as exists before the orders are unified every regard should be shown towards the conscientious beliefs of the members of these Churches.

(10) The Church of England has always adhered to the rule of episcopal ordination, but has never had any official theory of the ministry. It is clear that it neither can, nor need, make the acceptance or rejection of any theory of the ministry

a necessary condition of reunion. It can insist upon a unified ministry, and that unified ministry must be episcopal in the sense sketched above.

While different sections of the Church of England hold, or think they hold, different theories about the ministry, they are united as to the necessity of Episcopacy for the government of the united Church.

NOTE.

The above discussion is on the lines of my book, *The Doctrine of the Church and Christian Re-union* (see especially the preface to the second edition in which I examine the arguments of Professor Turner and Bishop Gore). Since it was published I have followed everything that has appeared on the subject, and have seen nothing which interferes with my conclusions. The only book of any moment which has appeared is Canon Streeter's book on *The Primitive Church*. That states in an extreme form the opinion I put forward in the Bampton Lectures, that there was no Biblical authority for any particular form of the ministry. The book of the Rev. Kenneth Mackenzie on *The Case for Episcopacy* and that of the Rev. N. P. Williams seem to me to fail by treating the questions dogmatically rather than historically. The latter I propose to examine later with greater care.

As to the statement of Bishop Gore—" The difference between the conception of the Apostolic Succession in the Episcopate which was held in earlier times and that which came slowly to acceptance in the West under the authority of St. Augustine (but never in the East) is very important, and has been rightly emphasised by Professor Turner. But he has never suggested that the due succession to the see was ever a substitute for the sacramental rite of the laying on of hands "—this entirely misconceives the point. What in the opinion of most people has been proved by Professor Turner is, that no theory of transmission of power or authority from the Apostles by ordination was held in the early Church. Grace and authority depend on the action of the Church in ordination and not on transmission. The Church is free therefore to make or change its own rules of ordination, or to validate ordinations irregularly performed. Neither true sacraments nor true orders depend on transmission.

A. C. GLOUCESTR:

Appendix 11

EPISCOPACY IN THE ORTHODOX CHURCH.

By the Rev. W. A. Wigram, D.D.

[This statement has been submitted to and received the approval of leading Orthodox theologians.]

The question that we have for discussion is the matter of Episcopacy in the Orthodox Church. How is it regarded, as an institution, by the Christians of that body, and how, as an institution, is it worked ? That is to say, how are Bishops appointed ; and when appointed, in what relation do they stand towards the Œcumenical Patriarch, to the clergy of their own dioceses, and to the monastic orders who may have houses within diocesan borders ? Other questions are, what is the Liturgical Authority of a Bishop, and what is his connection with the government of the land ? Also, what relations exist between him, or the church he stands for, and " Protestant " or non-episcopal churches ?

To answer this question, and also the various questions into which it is divided, it is needful to go back to first principles, and to see, first, what " the Church " means to the Orthodox Christian. Then, having grasped that, one may be able to see what Episcopacy is, and what it stands for, in that Church. That done, we may be able to see how principles that are part of the common heritage of all are applied in and by the " autocephalous " and " autonomous " churches that make up the one Orthodox Communion. These are a large and increasing number, and their importance and circumstances both vary greatly. Hence, the superficial differences between them are many, and that fact makes the unity of principle more striking and important.

Theory of the Church.

The whole conception of the Church, to the mind of an Eastern Christian, is " mystical " to a degree unfamiliar to the ordinary Western, if we may define a Mystic as one who looks through the appearance of things to the spiritual reality that is behind that appearance, and is veiled by it.

Thus, to him, the Church is the embodiment of the life of

God in the mind of man, and so the " Body of Christ." All human spirits that believe in Christ—those that are now on earth, those that have been so, some say even those that shall be so in the future—are members of the Body. The thought that only a small part of the Church is on earth, and that far the larger and more important part of it is beyond the veil, is one that is accepted verbally by the Western, but is allowed to drop to the back of his mind. It moulds the whole active mind of the Eastern. His instinctive resentment of the idea that the Church, being a body, must have a head on earth, is only one instance of the effect that this concept has upon his thought. Having thus existed, *ab initio mundi*, the Church, which is Holy, and is the vehicle of the spirit of truth, is naturally unchangeable. To those outside her she may seem to change, even as, for instance, an unchanging object may seem to change in shape and colour, according as it is seen from different angles, or through different coloured glasses. The seeming change, however, is in the outsider, not in the object. The Church, the pillar and ground of the truth, is unchanging as is God, who is the Truth. She is the body of Him, who is the same yesterday, to-day and for ever.

Naturally this Body, being in many lands and under many conditions, may have local names and local freedom of action, in the matter of ceremonies, for instance ; no part, however, can do what affects the whole without the concurrence of the whole. The formulation of doctrine in the Creed is something that obviously comes under that description, and, therefore, for any one part of the Church to alter that creed by itself—and, still more, to demand that others shall follow it in that action—is naturally wrong. Moreover, it is not only a wrong act, it is an act of self-severance from the Body, or rather—seeing that the act is a proof that Love, the bond of perfectness and unity, has already failed—it is a sign that severance has already taken place.

In the same way, any limb of the body that falls into any grave error is not cut off from the body by the act of any authority in it. The fact that it has proclaimed error and persisted in it is a sign that it has already cut itself off. " Heresy " is not error, even of the gravest. It is that self-assertive separation of spirit that is the natural interpretation of the word, and that is at the root of all

schisms in the body. That it should lead direct to error, or to a loss of the proportion of the Faith, is natural and inevitable.

As the life of the Church is the life of the Body of Christ, the Body has the power of distinguishing truth from error, and, as it can do this without fail, it is " infallible." This " infallibility," however, is not a gift or quasi-magical endowment attached to any one organisation, such as a council or group of Patriarchs. Still less is it to be thought of as the possession of any one official or Bishop. There is no " Charisma Infallibilitatis " in either council or Pope. Councils may reveal the consciousness of the Church, and it is in so far as they do that that they are themselves infallible. There are many doctrines of the Church (*e.g.*, those concerning the Panagia) that have never received the endorsement of any " General Council."

The Infallibility of the Church is a characteristic of the life of the whole Body. A living body, as a whole, has the power to accept and to assimilate what is " good "—*i.e.*, in accord with the principle of its life—it rejects, by the same power, what is " bad " and not in such accord. A living body may be some time in getting rid of any discordant element, such as the microbes of disease, or in transforming them, if they are transformable ; but it does it, infallibly, by virtue of the life that is in it. So, in the living body of the Church, it is the presence of the Spirit that is Life and Love—the Love that knits unity—that produces the corporate character that judges Truth aright. It is the pure in heart that can see God, and reflect Him, and lack of love dims both the seeing eye and the reflecting mirror. So, to speak of " Church Authority " in these matters is too " external " a statement. It is the Spirit of Love in the body that has power.

It is from this angle that the " orthodox-trained mind " approaches the question of the sacraments. They are acts of the Church, of the whole Body. Thus, a self-separated organisation can no more have valid sacraments than one separated leg can walk, or one separated joint grasp. And, as they are the acts of the whole body, on earth and beyond, all that body has a share in them. All living and departed are the partakers of the Eucharist. It is an extension of the thought of St. Paul. He said to Christians, " Ye are one

body, because ye are all partakers of the one bread," and the mystic thinker among the Orthodox says, " Because ye are one body, ye must be in some wise all Partakers." The point now is how they apply that principle to the sacrament of Ordination.

An ordination or consecration is, to Orthodox thinking, the act of the whole Church, the Body of Christ, and the act of Christ, who is the head of the body, acting through the organ that is set apart for that action, the Bishop. It is the body as a whole that has the continuous life, and the body as a whole that has the powers, though they are exercised and exercisable only through the organ. In like fashion, in the human body, it is the whole man that has the power of speech, or the power of passing on the gift of life to another, even though specialised organs may be needed. The act is the act of the whole being, through the appropriate organ. It is not the act of the organ apart from the whole.

So, when considering " Apostolic Succession," the idea of a separate life of the Episcopate, the idea of what is sometimes described as a " golden pipe, down from the Apostles," is simply not in the Orthodox scheme of things. There is Apostolic Succession because there is continuity of life and of thought in the whole body, but that life must be transmitted by those to whom the Church has given the duty.

Ordination without Bishops is unthinkable, and so also is ordination by Bishops who are not entitled to act, because they are acting apart from others. This is a truth that needs guarding, for efforts have been made of late to secure ordinations and consecration from " stray Bishops " acting alone—a procedure that would open the door to just that conception of a mechanical transmission against which the Orthodox Church protests.

One who ordains—or celebrates any sacrament—apart from the Church, has by the fact of his so acting apart severed himself from the living Body of Christ that is his own one source of power.

To ask whether a schismatic can ordain, or whether there can be valid orders apart from orthodox doctrine, and fellowship in the body, is like asking whether severed lips can speak. Bishop and Priest have their power, but in the body and in love, and so only. How necessary it is, however, to all

orthodox belief that the power should be exercised by the Bishop who has the right to do so appears from the story of the "Old Believers" in Russia. Regarding the Bishops collectively as having apostatised, and so severed themselves from the Church and lost their power, it never occurred to the "faithful remnant" that they might make priests for themselves by any sort of presbyterian ordination. They continued their corporate life, without priests or sacraments, till such time as God in his own way should restore a true episcopate, using such part of the Church rites as a layman might say, and no more.

It is sometimes urged, in the West, that as ordination is the act of the body as a whole, acting normally through the Bishops who have specially been set apart for the work, that therefore the body or its local representatives might exercise the power that is in them—though normally latent—if for any reason no Bishops should be available.

An orthodox thinker would reply that it is hardly profitable to argue whether such power would be actually "latent" in any body of Christians, seeing that to assume it, by the attempt to use such power in an act that would break church unity, would be in fact to "break the unity of the Spirit in the bond of Peace." An act that would create a schism would be an act against the spirit of love, and would be in itself a form of self-severance from the one source of all spiritual power.

He does not say, however, that any one system of government was definitely laid down by Christ. It is enough that one has become the custom of his living Body, from which no man or body of men may sever themselves without sin. It is the intent to remain in the body, to avoid causing any division in it, that is judged to be of the first importance.

It is, so far as we can judge, on this principle that sacramental acts, defective themselves, may be accepted "in the way of economy." Any act may be accepted as valid by the Church if it seems to have been done without the intent to cause a schism in the body, or even if those who are the heirs of an evil past—as Anglicans are in the matter of their use of the "Filioque" clause in the Creed—show a true spirit of unity. It is the Orthodox Church, that is the only true church, that is sole judge in this matter.

Appendix 12

ECONOMIC INTERCOMMUNION BETWEEN THE ANGLICAN AND THE ORTHODOX CHURCHES.

By the Rev. Canon J. A. Douglas.

That about which I have been asked to write in this memorandum is the establishment of Economic Intercommunion between the Anglican and Orthodox Churches.

Their Union or formal Intercommunion is outside my scope, but in showing briefly why I think that it is at present undesirable to do more than continue to discuss them as an ultimate objective, what is known as "Economic Intercommunion," will be made plain.

I. The Time not ripe for Union or Formal Intercommunion.

On the principles advanced by all Orthodox theologians, the Orthodox Church is to-day alone recognisable as the unique representative of the Church of Christ visible here in earth. Accordingly they declare themselves unable either to predicate that any church other than the Orthodox autokephalous churches, the totality of which constitute the Orthodox Church of to day, is a part of the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church or to accept as a member of that Church anyone who is not in its *communio in sacris*.

Further, since they hold that the admission of an individual to Orthodox *communio in sacris* would be tantamount to his recognition as a member of *the* Church, and that the establishment of its Intercommunion with another church would be tantamount to its union with that church, they hold *as in principle* that no one not a member of the Orthodox Church can be admitted to its *communio in sacris* and that an act of union between the Orthodox Church and any other church must precede Intercommunion between them.

In their strictness their equivalents for the terms *communio in sacris* and *Intercommunion* cover conjoint prayer, public

prayer, preaching and so on as well as sacramental observances.

Finally, the only basis on which Orthodox theologians admit the possibility of Union and Intercommunion between the Orthodox and any other church is their full dogmatic union. That is to say, before uniting with any other church, the Orthodox Church must be able to pronounce itself in agreement with that Church on the Faith as it (1) is revealed in Holy Scripture, (2) has been precised by the definitions of the Seven Œcumenical Councils and is preserved, (3) in the writings of the Fathers, and (4) the tradition of the Church. That that formula presents the historic position of the Orthodox Church, and that there is no likelihood of its modification in the near future I venture to think indisputable.

On the other hand there are many considerations belonging to the category of *imponderabilia* and others fairly easy of expression, which make it less stark and impossible than it would appear at first sight.

In the sense of precisions of the Faith, the only dogmas to which the Orthodox are tied are those precised by the Seven Œcumenical Councils. With the exception of those of the Seventh Œcumenical Council, those dogmas were precised to determine the Christological and kindred controversies of centuries IV–VII and—except for the interpolation of the *Filioque* in the Nicene Creed*—Orthodox theologians accept our Thirty-nine Articles and other formularies as generally consonant with them.

But the dogmatic agreement which the Orthodox specify as the necessary basis of Union is not to be identified with agreement upon *precised* dogmas. It is an agreement upon everything which is to be regarded as essential to the Faith —*i.e.*, to the Faith not as a body of abstract intellectual propositions which require interpretation, but as the expression of the collective consciousness of the mystic life of the Church in which from the beginning all its members have shared.

As such the Faith is fully intelligible only to the members of the Church and can never be precised exhaustively. The

* The Orthodox insist that the dropping of the *filioque* is a necessary term of reunion, not because of its possible theological implication but because it is an interpolation in the Œcumenical Creed.

Nicene Creed and other dogmatic precisions of the Œcumenical Councils are incontrovertible, not solely because they were precised by the supreme organ of the Church, i.e., the totality of the episcopate, but also because they were recognised by general consent as being a true expression of the collective consciousness of the Church articulated under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. They are capable only of one interpretation and, if occasion should arise, would themselves be capable of restatement by an Œcumenical Council in order to elucidate that interpretation.

Accordingly in the formula quoted above the stress is not on the dogmas of the Œcumenical Councils and for our purpose the reference to them may be regarded almost as parenthetic.

As used in the formula quoted the significance of the term *tradition of the Church* is in antithesis to the significance which we usually assign to it. It does not signify the body of traditional beliefs, customs and so on which obtain generally in the Church. It signifies the mystic life of the Church which stretches in unbroken and identical *paradosis* back to Christ Himself. The collective consciousness of what that mystic life is, of how it is communicated to the individual and so on, is preserved in the Church to-day by the operation of the Holy Spirit and is identical with that which has been preserved in it from the beginning. No Protestant could contend more stubbornly than do Orthodox theologians that the Faith is fully and manifestly revealed in the Holy Scriptures, that nothing can be added to or subtracted from the Revelation of which they are the fountain and that unceasing resource to them is *kat' exochen* the divinely given means by which the Holy Spirit quickens and maintains in the members of the Church the collective consciousness of their mystic life. It is to the Holy Scriptures that they not only send the individual member of their Church in order to realise the Faith intellectually and to live by it, but that they also make their appeal against those whom they hold to have departed from it.

Finally in the formula and for its completion " the writings of the Fathers " are conjoined to the tradition of the Church because in spite of divergences in individual writings of that category, they find in their composite picture an expres-

sion of the collective consciousness of the Church's mystic life in the first nine centuries which is identical with that which is their own and which they find manifest in Holy Scripture.

This is only a thumb-nail sketch of the Orthodox position but if—and I have the temerity to think that it does—it gives an accurate impression of it, it should be plain that in the category of dogma the Orthodox include not only the precisions of the Œcumenical Councils but every feature of that expression of the mystic life of the Church which they hold to have been determined by Christ Himself.

If hitherto the doctrine of the Nature of the Church, the Scriptures, the Ministry, the Sacraments and other such features have not been precised dogmatically, their rightful conception belongs to the region of dogma.

It is thus that as criteria of that dogmatic agreement which they predicate as the essential preliminary of union, the Orthodox cannot recognise that those features are present in a given church simply because their external form is there. Indeed, they are far more concerned with their inner significance. Thus in regard to our Ministry, they certainly ask whether it is in unbroken external succession to the Apostles but are even more insistent to know what we mean by a bishop, a priest, a deacon.

No precisions in regard to the Church, the Scriptures, the Ministry and the Sacraments can bind the Orthodox Church unless and until they are made by a Council of the totality of its episcopate which they accept as the Eighth Œcumenical Council. But pending the occurrence of such a general Council the doctrine upon them which Orthodox theologians by general consent hold to have always been in the *paradosis* of the Church is to be accounted as dogma.

As to what in its precise definition that doctrine is, it is not easy to estimate. Orthodox theology makes a sharp distinction between *dogmata*, i.e., incontrovertible precisions of the Faith and *theologoumena*, i.e., matters of theological opinion.

The contrasts, e.g., between the doctrine of the Sacraments as set forth in the Confession of Dositheos and in Metrophanes or in the writings of the Russian Philaret and the Greek Androutsos are very considerable, so that it would not

be surprising if, when *theologoumena* were set aside, the doctrine which remained to be reckoned as dogma proved to be by no means so definitive as is usually imagined.*

Moreover, while it would be bold indeed to forecast the future of Orthodox theology, it is clearly entering upon a new period. Orthodox nations which even 30 years ago were still in a great measure isolated from Western Europe are now entering the orbit of its thought and tendencies, and the Orthodox clergy are being trained in scientific methods. By itself, the crash of the Tsardom could not have failed to liberate movements in the Russian Church, which has also unquestionably lost much of its external conservatism in the terrible persecution inflicted upon it by the anti-Christian Bolshevik régime. The loss of territory by the Turks and the extirpation of Christianity from Asia Minor has brought together practically the whole Greek nation in a single progressive state. Indeed, many events and *imponderabilia*, among which not the least to be reckoned are the existence of a great Orthodox dispersion in America and elsewhere and the repercussions of their active participation in the Reunion and kindred movements of the past twelve years, indicate that Orthodox theology is beginning to undergo a transition.

Owing to that mystic characteristic by which the Orthodox think of their Church as an organism of love and life rather than of reason, and to their general consciousness that the polity of their Church being what it is, if it is not to disintegrate, they must avoid disruptive controversies, it would seem probable that that transition will be in content and not in form.

If that forecast be justified, the already existing " schools of thought " among the Orthodox will tend to differentiation and will be represented in all the national autokephalous churches, some of which will as a whole be more conservative than others. In this process the region of dogma may tend to be circumscribed and of *theologoumena* to be enlarged, so that in the not far distant future dogmatic agreement

* Contrast, for example, Gavin's *Greek Orthodox Thought*, Mowbrays, 1925, and Zankow's *Das Orthodoxe Christenthum das Ostens*, Berlin, 1928 (trans. by Lowrie, Student Christian Movement, 1929).

between the Anglican and Orthodox Churches may become more possible.

But as the Anglican Church is and as the Orthodox Church is, their dogmatic agreement would not appear to be on the horizon and, especially in view of our present sharp domestic Anglican controversies, I should anticipate that if a serious attempt were now made to discuss terms of Union between us and them, the result would be to register not agreements but present-day dogmatic conflicts, which both Churches might regard as a *damnosa hereditus* in 1940.

None the less, although I venture to regard Anglican and Orthodox Union as humanly speaking at present incapable of achievement, I venture also to think that it is very possible to make a noteworthy advance in preparing the *terrain* for it by the way of what the Orthodox designate as Economy.

II. The Orthodox Principle of Economy.

Economy (*Oikonomia*) is the administration of the household, and Orthodox theologians hold in general principle that the Church is *tamiouchos—i.e.*, holds stewardship in her own household and is charged therefore with the economy of the external side of its mystic life.

No dogma having been formulated in regard to the Principle of Economy by an Oecumenical Council and few Orthodox theologians having discussed it in detail, it is impossible either to state precisely the scope or the organs of its exercise.

All Orthodox theologians rule the whole region of dogma completely out of its scope. And all are agreed that its scope includes the prescription of binding canons, the varying them and so on.

They appear also to be in general agreement that for the good of the Church and the welfare of individual souls, the canons and general customs which are held binding on the whole Church, may be put on one side by the exercise of Economy. And though the term also covers action where no canon or binding custom exists, the term Economy is used specifically for action which dispenses with them.

In regard to the persons by whom Economy may be exercised, there would appear to be a measure of agreement that where reference to a higher authority cannot be made, even a priest, and possibly a layman, may exercise it, but only

where he is convinced that the authority over him would approve. A bishop must frequently exercise Economy in minor matters, but again there is something like agreement that he can only exercise it rightly where he is convinced or has ascertained that the authorities of his particular autokephalous Church would approve.

Though there are precedents for the individual exercise of Economy by autokephalous churches, Orthodox theologians are by no means agreed that except in emergency they are right in exercising it.

III. The Exercise of Economy in Relation to the non-Orthodox.

As has been noted, the Orthodox cannot predicate that those churches which are not in union with themselves are parts of the Church.

All such churches form a *terra incognita*, in which it is impossible for them to recognise the existence of the mystic life of the Church. They can, therefore, predicate in no case that any Ministries, Sacraments, etc., other than their own, are *per se* valid or real. Nor if the strictness of the letter be not dispensed by Economy, can they have relations of any kind with the non-Orthodox. In measure, however, or so far as, but only so far as (*a*) the Faith of a non-Orthodox church approximates to the Orthodox Faith and (*b*) no injury will be done to the Church, that strictness may be relaxed by Economy. But its exercise is entirely a matter of discretion.

Economy may thus be exercised in regard to the non-Orthodox—

(*a*) on receiving them into the Orthodox Church,
(*b*) when they have the intention of acceding to it,
(*c*) in permitting Orthodox individuals to share in their Church life, and in permitting them to share in Orthodox Church life,
(*d*) in official relations with them.

Whether it be so exercised by the individual action of an Orthodox Bishop, by the individual action of a particular autokephalous Church or by the concurrence of all the autokephalous Churches, its exercise cannot form a binding

precedent, but is only *pro hac vice* or until the synodic decree which regulates it is repealed.

In regard to the reception of adherents from the Roman Catholic, Nestorian and Monophysite Churches it has been immemorial to receive them by Chrismation in their Baptism, Confirmation (Chrism), Marriage and Orders. But at times, when the Orthodox has been intensely embittered by Roman Catholic proselytization, that Economy has been forbidden. Thus in 1629 the Russian Church decided to rebaptise all converts, but in 1667 revised that decree and ordered all converts from churches in which the Trinitarian formula is used, to be received in their Baptism. On the other hand, in 1756 the four ancient Patriarchates ordered all converts to be rebaptised, chrismated and reordained, and, though nowadays that order has lapsed and the Economy is exercised, a bishop of the Papal obedience was rebaptised, chrismated, ordained and reconsecrated in 1840.

For the economic acceptance of the Sacraments of non-Orthodox churches, the Orthodox guiding principle would appear to be (i) the fulfilment of the Orthodox external necessary requirements, and (ii) the close approximation of the meaning which those churches attach to them to their own. The former without the latter would certainly not satisfy them.

As to whether, *e.g.*, a non-episcopally ordained minister could be received in his Orders, depends on whether the necessity for the imposition of hands by a bishop is or is not integral to the Faith. Professor Dyovounites holds that a ministry not externally in the Apostolic Succession *could* be validated by Economy. As to what the mind of Orthodox theologians may become on this matter in the future, it is impossible to forecast, but there can be no doubt that if it were precised to-day it would be practically and emphatically unanimous to the contrary.

Up to fifteen years ago resort for the Sacraments by the Orthodox to non-Orthodox ministers, and by the non-Orthodox to Orthodox ministers, was treated in practically all Orthodox discussions of the subject as in principle outside the sphere in which Economy can be exercised. But to-day that opinion would appear to be in process of revision.

IV. Economic Relations of the Orthodox and the Anglican Churches.

Research would probably show that the close relations which existed between the Anglican and Orthodox Churches in century 17 were characterised by much exercise of Economy. But after the beginning of century 18 intercourse between them practically ceased. On its resumption in the first half of century 19, the Orthodox knew very little about the Church of England and appear to have been unable to differentiate between it and the other Protestant Churches of Europe.

In consequence, the authorities of no Orthodox Church were ready to sanction any specific exercise of Economy towards Anglicans until the close of century 19, when the Oecumenical Patriarchate authorised the burial of Anglicans whom no Anglican minister could be found to bury.

Since then, however, the economic relations between the two churches have had an extraordinary development.

That this has been the case is due, on the one hand, to the increased contacts of Orthodox with Anglicans, and especially to the brotherly sympathy shown them in their sufferings during and after the Great War, and, on the other hand, to a continually increasing understanding on the part of the Orthodox of the nature and history of the Anglican Churches which has resulted from the investigation and better first-hand knowledge of their theologians.

As things stand to-day, the Orthodox view of the Anglican Church as a totality may be summarised as that—

(*a*) The formularies of the Church of England are capable of an interpretation that would satisfy the Orthodox requirements for Union ;

(*b*) Throughout all the Anglican Churches a current of life and belief exists which approximates to the life and belief of the Orthodox Church.

(*c*) If the totality of the Anglican Episcopate synodically declared the Faith of the totality of the Anglican Churches to be essentially the same as that of the Orthodox Church, the questions which would delay the Union of the two communions would be easy of solution.

That view does not signify that Orthodox theologians

consider such a declaration by the Anglican Episcopate to be on the horizon. On the contrary, they understand thoroughly the " comprehensive " nature of the Anglican Church. As I understand them, if the other currents in the Anglican Churches were absorbed not in the Anglo-Catholic current but in the central, historic High Church current, they would account the Union of the two churches to be possible. But they are well aware of the strength of the Evangelical, the Modernist and other currents in the Anglican Churches and, as should be noted very carefully on their essential principles, they cannot contemplate sectional union or sectional relations with any church. It is possible that they might enter into special relations by Economy with a particular Anglican Church, but that contingency is probably out of the question.

Nevertheless, their study alike of the formularies and history of the Anglican Churches, as also of their present-day currents of thought, enables them to pronounce the great advance in the exercise of Economy which has been made in the relations of the two churches during the past 20 years, as justifiable on dogmatic grounds.

The present economic relations of the two churches have not been developed, however, solely by the theologian. If the coming together of two churches is conditioned by the measure of homogeneity in their mystic life, it is only so far as they have contacts in the persons of their individual members that they can realise their kinship. Life and Work together are the great producers not only of the will to reunion but of the conviction of its practical necessity.

The practical necessity which has stimulated the Orthodox investigation of the Anglican dogmatic complex, and is held by the authorities of probably all the particular Orthodox to warrant the maximum possible exercise of Economy between the two churches, is analogous to that practical necessity which has produced the South Indian Union proposals.

In 1904, when economic relations were practically non-existent, between the two churches, the famous Oecumenical Patriarch Joachim III told me neither to be despondent nor in a hurry about the approach between the two churches, and added that " things would happen overseas to create a position."

That far-seeing chance prophecy has been amply borne out.

Even in 1904 the large number of Orthodox emigrants in South Africa, East Africa, Australia, Canada, and, above all, in the United States, had created a position. If the pastoral care of that Orthodox dispersion could have been organised as a unity, it would have been impossible for it to have been undertaken adequately. To say nothing of scattered families, even in districts where the Orthodox were in numbers large enough to form congregations, they could not be furnished with an adequate supply of clergy for the administration of Baptism, of the marriage blessing, burial and an occasional Liturgy. But the immigrants were of Greek, Russian, Roumanian, Serb, Syrian, Bulgar and other nationalities, and though all the Orthodox Churches use the same services and hold the same Faith, they do not use the same language, and according to their nationality have varying customs, hagiologies and so on. If the problem had been one of creating a single church for all the Orthodox where none existed, its solution would have been difficult enough. But, at least in modern times, the Orthodox *in partibus* have looked to their particular home church to take care of them. In the United States there were already separate Russian, Greek and Syrian " dioceses " with enormous areas and relatively few people, overlapping each other and with churches in the same towns ; and over and above all that, the national rivalries of the Near East forbade any attempt at co-ordination.

As things were it was to be expected that, as the Patriarch Joachim said, Things would happen, and, indeed, they were already happening. Individual and isolated Orthodox families were lapsing into indifferentism or attaching themselves to other churches, regular worship and strong church life were impossible for the Orthodox in all except a few centres. And, most serious thing of all, the young generation which was growing up English speaking and americanised or anglicised was largely being lost to Orthodoxy.

For years the authorities of the overseas Anglican Churches had taken a wise and far-seeing view of the problem. With few exceptions their bishops discouraged the proselytisation of Orthodox immigrants and encouraged their clergy and people to lend them their churches and to render them every acceptable hospitality and assistance.

It was thus that even 25 years ago a very close and special

relation had come into being between the Anglicans and Orthodox in Canada, Australia and elsewhere. Their clergy attended each other's services and, except on the rare visits of their own priests, many Orthodox laity were regular worshippers in Anglican Churches.

In the United States where the number of Orthodox immigrants had become a perceptible percentage of the population, the *liaison* was closest of all and the attention of the American Episcopal Church was already addressed to the problem of what was to be the future of the Orthodox. With their attachment to their nationality and to their Church, the older generation which was averse to merging in the Protestant churches was losing the habit of religious observance and their children were growing up without religious practice or training.

Under the circumstances, and the Anglican bishops being ready to do what they were asked, or not being desirous to do more than they were asked, more than one Orthodox bishop considered whether or not to sanction their people when in permanent isolation and emergency resorting to Anglican ministers for the Sacraments. But the general Orthodox view of the Anglican Church was still very doubtful, the non-permissibility of economy in regard to the Sacraments was assumed and, even if that had not been so, the home authorities of the particular Orthodox Churches were indifferent to the problem and did not envisage it.

Nonetheless, 25 years ago sporadic instances of individual Orthodox resorting to Anglicans for Baptism and Communion, with the private permission of their local church authorities or without it, were occurring increasingly overseas.

Many happenings would appear to have brought what was impossible in 1904 well into the region of possibility in 1930.

(1) The continued stream of Orthodox immigrants of all nationalities have increased both the difficulty and the urgency of providing for their pastoral care and the home authorities of their particular churches are now well alive to the great importance of that problem.

(2) The theoretical difficulties in the way of the Orthodox authorities authorising the exercise of economy in regard to the Sacraments have been greatly diminished.

As has been noted above, in deciding whether non-Orthodox

Sacraments can be accepted by economy, Orthodox theologians enquire into their external form, but are even more concerned with their inner meaning. In 1904 the most favourable judgment in regard to Anglican Orders was that as regards their external form, they could be accepted but that as regards their inner meaning, elucidation was needful. Realising that unless the question of Anglican Orders was settled the Orthodox authorities could not consider authorising economy in regard to the Marriage Rite, Communion, etc., some American priests addressed a formal enquiry to the Oecumenical Patriarchate in 1902 as to whether Anglican Ordinations could be accepted by the Orthodox. The Oecumenical Patriarchate appointed a commission to consider the matter, but beyond the publication of an examination of the question which Professor Androutsos* submitted to it, and in which he indicated that if certain doubts were removed Anglican Orders could be accepted not in principle but by economy, it took no action.

In 1920, on the invitation of the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Oecumenical Patriarchate sent a delegation to the Lambeth Conference. Its report† spoke hopefully of dogmatic agreement between the two Churches and was drafted by Professor Comnenos, who in another document at the same time expressed a favourable opinion as to Anglican Orders.

In 1921 the present Patriarch Meletios of Alexandria, who was at the time in America and engaged on the Orthodox problem there, became Oecumenical Patriarch and at once set the 1902 Commission to work again. In 1922 Professor Comnenos published the results of its investigation in book form,‡ concluding that Anglican Orders were capable of acceptance by economy and recommending not only that they should be accepted, but *that Anglicans when in emergency or permanent isolation should be admitted to Orthodox Communion by Economy and vice versa.* The Oecumenical Patriarch with the vote of his Synod at once acted on the former recommendation, notifying the Archbishop of Canterbury and the authorities of the other Orthodox autokephalous

* "English Ordinations," trans. by Grove Campbell, 1909 (Grant Richards).

† Αἱ Ἀγγλικανικαι Χειροτονίαι. Constantinople, 1921. A summary appeared in *The Christian East*, Vol. II, 3 September, 1921.

‡ A translation was printed in *The Christian East*, Vol. III, 1 March, 1922.

churches of his decision and requesting the latter to adhere to it. The Churches of Jerusalem and Cyprus at once adhered to it but the other five did not reply.

Their silence in no way implied dissent, but was due to their view that a matter of such importance could be decided only by the concerted decision and action of all the autokephalous Churches and their unwillingness to allow a precedent for the decisions and actions of the Oecumenical Patriarchate alone to commit the whole Orthodox Church.

But, if they have postponed their reply until concerted action can be taken in a Pan-Orthodox Synod, there has been no opposition *per se* to the Œcumenical Patriarch Meletios decision, which has been very widely approved and acted upon and the reversal of which is hardly within probability.

De facto, therefore, the economic acceptance of Anglican Orders is to be taken as having been made.

In regard to the abstract question of economic intercommunion, so of the admission of the non-Orthodox to Orthodox Sacraments and of the resort of the Orthodox to non-Orthodox Sacraments, and of the practical question as to whether such economic intercommunion is warranted in the case of Anglicans, both have in a measure been solved *in ambulando*. The economic relations between the two Churches must in any case have been greatly developed by the natural forces at work overseas and by the steadily growing favourable view of the Anglican Churches taken by Orthodox theologians. During the Great War, however, they reached an extent and development unprecedented in the relations between the Orthodox and any other Church. Economies exercised during a period of catastrophe, of course, stand by themselves and their repetition is not necessarily to be expected. But, nothing untoward occurring, the position which they create tends to persist and they form precedents.

If the many cases in which the Orthodox administered Holy Communion to Anglicans and received it at Anglican Holy Tables, had stood by themselves, they might have remained as an exceptional War Time anomaly, but they did not stand alone. Even before 1922, it had become altogether normal among the Orthodox to treat the Anglican Clergy as if their Orders were recognised, and the interchange of pulpits had become frequent. In fact, the economies exercised were

exercised because both overseas and in the theatre of the War many Orthodox felt that the greatest measure of Economy possible was warranted, and that short of Union the approximation of the two Churches could not be greater.

A provisional practical solution of the questions of the permissibility of economic intercommunion and of its being warranted on Orthodox principles with Anglicans by present circumstances was thus given.

After the War the Orthodox exercise of economic intercommunion with Anglicans not in emergency ceased, but instances of it in such cases continued to occur all over the world and are continuing to occur at the present time.

The position thus reached has been stabilised by the Oecumenical Patriarchate's acceptance of Anglican Orders. But no Orthodox Church has pronounced either as to the permissibility of economic intercommunion in general or of its warranty in the case of the Anglican Church.

V. In Conclusion.

If the above be a fair presentation of the position, it will be noted, that :—

(1) The time is not ripe for the final discussion of the Union and formal Intercommunion of the Anglican and Orthodox Churches ;

(2) *de facto* the wall of partition between them has been to some extent dissolved by their economic relations ;

(3) that breaking down has been accomplished partly by the work of Orthodox theologians but chiefly by practical exigencies, so that, though restricted, economic Intercommunion is being exercised between the two churches ;

(4) the existing economic relations between the two churches have not been formally sanctioned by the Orthodox authorities ;

(5) in U.S.A. and in the British overseas dominions the relations of the two churches present a problem of great practical urgency and moment ;

(6) formal authorisation of economic intercommunion between the two churches by the Orthodox would greatly facilitate the solution of the overseas problem.

That formal authorisation can be given only by a General Council of the Orthodox Church or by each and all of the Orthodox autokephalous churches authorising it synodically.

Appendix 13

REUNION WITH THE OLD CATHOLIC CHURCHES.

By the Rev. C. B. Moss, B.D.

The Old Catholic Churches are a group of eight self-governing churches in communion with the archiepiscopal see of Utrecht.

For their history and ecclesiastical position see my book, *The Old Catholic Churches and Reunion* (S.P.C.K., 2s.). A shorter account is given in *The Old Catholic Churches in Christendom* (Church Assembly Publications Board, 3d.).

Reunion with the Old Catholic Churches now is quite practicable : It is highly desirable : and the method by which it can be brought about is clear.

(1) Reunion with the Old Catholic Churches is practicable.

There is no other body of Christians with which reunion can be more easily accomplished. In the case of the non-episcopal bodies, there are difficulties connected with the ministry, and the profound differences as to the nature of the Church and the place of the Sacraments in Christian life which lie behind them. Even the Swedish Church, which has retained episcopal succession, is divided from us by the absence of Confirmation, in our sense, and by other differences. It is certain that any attempt to ignore these difficulties would create widespread resentment, and quite possibly a schism, among ourselves. The Eastern Churches, Orthodox and Separated, have a psychological approach to the question so different from our own that, while the understanding between us is growing rapidly, complete reunion is still far off. Even greater dogmatic and psychological differences exist between us and the Roman Communion, with the additional difficulty of mutual enmity and suspicion, aggravated by the unceasing efforts of proselytizing agents to win converts, and the unfair consequences of the *Ne Temere* decree in cases of mixed marriage.

But there are no such obstacles to reunion between us and the Old Catholic Churches. The relations between us have always been friendly. Five Lambeth Conferences in

succession have passed resolutions desiring closer relations with the Old Catholics, and sanctioning their admission to communion in Anglican Churches in certain conditions. The same policy has been adopted by the Old Catholics towards us. The German Old Catholic Church many years ago passed a canon giving Anglicans the right of communion. The other Old Catholic Churches will admit Anglicans to communion, though in Holland further conditions are required. There is no difficulty about Orders. In 1925 the Old Catholic Churches formally accepted the validity of Anglican Orders; not merely holding, like some of the Eastern Churches, that Anglican Orders are of equal value with Roman, Old Catholic, and Armenian Orders, and are capable of being made valid by the exercise of "economy," but that they are, in the full sense of the word, valid. Old Catholic Orders are accepted as valid, in the Western sense, even by the Church of Rome.

There are no difficulties as to jurisdiction. There are no Old Catholics in any country where the Anglican Communion has jurisdiction, except the United States, where the Old Catholic Church, consisting of Poles and Lithuanians, is in no sense a rival to the Episcopal Church. The Old Catholic bishops have promised the Archbishop of Canterbury not to intrude upon the territory of a friendly church. (See *Report of Lambeth Conference of* 1920, p. 154.)

The only remaining obstacles to reunion are mutual ignorance, and the existence of doubts among the Old Catholics as to the real nature of the Anglican churches. The removal of the former obstacle must take time, but need not take a long time, because the Old Catholic Churches are small. The latter obstacle can be removed in the way which I shall describe later.

The great majority of the Old Catholics are Dutch or German speaking. They belong to nations whose languages are akin to our own, and which were originally evangelised by missionaries from the British islands, Saint Willibrord, Saint Boniface, and Saint Gall. They are familiar with modern thought and modern criticism; their problems, like ours, are the problems of the modern world. Like us, they believe in, and are accustomed to, government by consent of the governed. Their services are entirely in the vernacular,

and are audible and congregational; they have a married clergy, and, except in conservative Holland, communion in both kinds; even in Holland communion in both kinds is now given in some parishes. Their forms of government are not unlike our own; each National church is self governing, with its own synod, in which the bishop, clergy, and representatives of the laity take part; the Conference of Bishops, which meets about every three years, corresponds exactly on a small scale to the Lambeth Conference. In many places Old Catholics are accustomed to acting in union with ourselves. At Lucerne the Swiss Old Catholic Church and the American Episcopal Church share one building; at Munich, Anglicans communicate at the Old Catholic services, which are held in the English Church (there being now no English chaplain); at Hamburg, the Old Catholics, having no resident priest, communicate at the English Church. Old Catholics coming to England are commended to the English clergy.

(2) Reunion with the Old Catholic Churches is desirable.

Reunion of any kind is of the utmost importance. But reunion with the Old Catholic Churches would have special advantages of its own.

(*a*) It would extend further the possibility of the pastoral care of members of both communions living in isolation. There are many Anglicans and Old Catholics living in places on the Continent where there is no priest of their own church. Much more could be done for them if we were in full communion, because all the clergy on both sides would be bound to look after such people. Dutch Old Catholics go to the Dutch Indies, where there is no Old Catholic organisation; they could be put in touch with Anglican chaplains there. The fact that the majority of the white population of South Africa is Dutch might be of some significance, if the Old Catholic Church of Holland, which is the true heir of the medieval Bishopric of Utrecht (precisely as the modern Church of England is the heir of the medieval provinces of Canterbury and York), were in full communion with the Church of the Province of South Africa.

(*b*) It would give to the Anglican Communion an international position. Of all the larger sections of Christendom, the Anglican Communion is the least international; apart

from the Mission field, it is confined to the British Empire and the United States. But the Old Catholic Communion, small as it is, is really international. At an Old Catholic Congress eight European States are represented ; Holland, Germany, France, Switzerland, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, and Poland. We should be able to understand the continental point of view much better than at present if we were in close and continual contact with churches, even though small, in all these states. International friendships would be formed, which would help the cause of world peace. A wider horizon would open for the whole Anglican Communion when it came to be generally realised that we were in full communion with bishops and churches on the Continent of Europe. The ecclesiastical Straits of Dover would cease to exist. Lord Hugh Cecil has said that the only reunion which is worth having is international ; on the other hand, the first thing which led the thoughts of Robert Hugh Benson towards Rome was his realising that outside the English-speaking world and its dependencies the English Church was nowhere.

(*c*) Reunion with the Old Catholics would be a long step towards reunion with the Orthodox Eastern Churches, which have a very high regard for the Old Catholics. The last message of the Œcumenical Patriarch Constantine V to his Anglican friends was " not to forget the Old Catholics."

(*d*) The Declaration of Utrecht, a translation of which accompanies this memorandum, is the dogmatic basis of the Old Catholic Churches. For its own sake, apart from reunion, the acceptance of this formula would be of inestimable value, especially if it could be made the basis of further negotiations for union with other sections of Christendom.

One advantage of making this document the basis for proposals for reunion is that it is not an Anglican document. Nobody can suspect it of being influenced by the views of any particular Anglican party. At the same time it is so entirely in accordance with the teaching and spirit of the Prayer Book that it is difficult to see how anyone loyal to that teaching and that spirit could refuse to accept it.

The objection has been raised, that to accept the Declaration of Utrecht would be a departure from the policy of previous Lambeth Conferences, the policy of only requiring

acceptance of the Lambeth Quadrilateral, and that to accept the principles of any particular Church would make reunion impossible.

But the Lambeth Quadrilateral, or the "Appeal to All Christian People," 1920, is an Anglican formula; and it seems unwise if we really want reunion to insist on this formula only. If one key won't fit the lock, try another. The Declaration of Utrecht, issued in 1889, is a modern document, and therefore cannot be compared with the Thirty-nine Articles, the Decrees of Trent, the Confession of Augsburg, or the Westminster Confession. The contention of the present writer is that the Declaration of Utrecht is in accordance with Holy Scripture, and with the standards of the Church of England and the other Anglican Churches. If this contention is true, and if we can obtain reunion with the Old Catholics without any schism among ourselves, or any hindrance to union in other directions, by formally accepting the Declaration of Utrecht, why should we not do so? To lay down that our favourite formula, and no other, must be the basis for all negotiations, is to exhibit the attitude which we deplore when we meet it in others, as the most insuperable barrier to reunion of any kind. The first section of the Declaration expresses adherence to the faith of the primitive Church, formulated in the Œcumenical Creeds, and in the unanimous decisions of the Œcumenical Councils held in the first thousand years. This appeal to the primitive Church against mediæval and modern innovations has been characteristic of the Anglican Communion ever since the Reformation. Thus, the Preamble to the Canons of the Church of Ireland, signed by every clergyman of that Church, says: "The Church of Ireland . . . doth continue to profess the faith of Christ as professed by the Primitive Church"; and, "The Church of Ireland . . . doth hereby affirm its constant witness against all those innovations in doctrine and worship, whereby the primitive faith hath been from time to time defaced and overlaid." It is to be observed that this section of the Declaration would commit us to nothing which may not be proved by Holy Scripture, for what cannot be thus proved was clearly not believed "always"; nor to everything believed and practised in the first thousand years of the Church, but only to

those propositions formally decreed by the whole Church to be " of faith " ; and to them we are committed already. Simple acceptance of the Nicene Creed is both too much and not enough ; too much, because it contains the clause " and the Son," which has never been accepted in the East, and is omitted by the Old Catholics ; not enough, because it contains no safeguards against the errors of Nestorius and Eutyches, which have by no means perished from the world.

Sections 2 to 5 repudiate new dogmas introduced by Rome, on the ground that they are not in accordance with Holy Scripture, or with the teaching of the primitive Church. Every Anglican priest has solemnly promised to teach nothing, as necessary to eternal salvation, but that which he shall be persuaded may be concluded and proved by the Scriptures. He is therefore bound to refuse to recognise as dogmas necessary to salvation any propositions not in harmony with the teaching of the primitive Church, which recognised no ultimate authority other than Holy Scripture. And the Declaration of Utrecht says no more than this.

The actual decrees rejected are :

(I.) The new dogmas of the Vatican Council, which have already been formally repudiated by the Provincial Synod of Canterbury, on the motion of Bishop Christopher Wordsworth.

(II.) The dogma of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin, which has no Scriptural basis, is contrary to the teaching of the Fathers, and even of such late writers as Saint Bernard and Saint Thomas Aquinas, and is indeed quite meaningless to those who do not accept Saint Augustine's theory of " Original Guilt " : see Pusey's " First Eirenicon " (based on Cardinal Turrecremata), and N. P. Williams's " Ideas of the Fall and Original Sin," p. 417.

(III.) The Bulls *Unigenitus* and *Auctorem Fidei*, and the *Syllabus Errorum* of 1864, so far as they are contrary to the doctrine of the primitive Church. The Bull *Unigenitus*, which Pope Clement XI in 1713 compelled all bishops and chapters to accept, on pain of excommunication, condemned 101 propositions, of which the following are examples :—

(78) " A man is separated from the chosen people, of which the Jewish people was a figure, and whose Head is

Jesus Christ, as much by not living according to the Gospel, as by not believing the Gospel."

(80) " The reading of Holy Scripture is for all."

(81) " The obscurity of the holy Word of God is no reason for lay persons to excuse themselves from reading it."

(84) " To tear the New Testament from the hands of Christians, or to keep it closed from them, by taking away from them the means of understanding it, is to stop up the mouth of Christ to them."

The Bull *Auctorem Fidei* (1794), condemned 85 propositions passed by the Synod of Pistoia, the chief of which, perhaps, was a statement that the Pope's authority is derived from the Church.

The *Syllabus Errorum* (1864), was an attack on freedom of religion and other axioms of modern civilised society : see Nielsen, " History of the Papacy in the Nineteenth Century," vol. II, p. 258 ; Salmon, " Infallibility of the Church," p. 440.

(IV.) The disciplinary decrees of the Council of Trent and its dogmatic decrees where not in harmony with the teaching of the primitive Church. This agrees with the Anglican Article XXI, written with reference to this Council : for the Old Catholic appeal to the primitive Church is equivalent to the Anglican appeal to Scripture, since the Primitive Church recognized Scripture as the ultimate authority in doctrine.

This rejection of the infallibility of Trent is of enormous importance, because it is the action of the Tridentine Fathers in making tradition equal to Scripture, and thereby imposing on Latin Christendom a large number of mediæval accretions as necessary dogmas, that has been for three centuries the great obstacle to the reunion of Western Christendom. It was the discovery of Leibniz that the decrees of Trent were regarded, even by Gallicans, as beyond criticism that made him break off his negotiations with Bossuet, which at one time were very hopeful. But the Old Catholics, in the Declaration of Utrecht, have ventured to do what the Gallicans would never do, go behind Trent.

It would be a great advantage to have an official modern statement of the reasons why we cannot be Roman Catholics. At present no such statement exists. (The XXXIX Articles do not meet modern requirements.) It would help to allay

the widespread suspicion that we are slowly moving towards absorption into the Roman Communion. The reasons given by the Declaration of Utrecht are such as might have been accepted by all our leading theologians of every school, from the Reformation to the present day.

The Sixth Section of the Declaration of Utrecht asserts "The ancient Catholic doctrine concerning the Sacrament of the Altar, that we receive the Body and Blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ under the species of bread and wine"; and further, that the Eucharist is a sacrifice in this sense, and in this sense only, that it is the perpetual commemoration of the sacrifice made once for all on the Cross, and the act by which we represent and appropriate to ourselves the one offering which Jesus Christ makes in Heaven. If we respect the teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and other parts of the New Testament, of the whole primitive Church, and of the ancient liturgies, Eastern as well as Western, we cannot say less than this: if we are to avoid the controversies which have raged about this subject for a thousand years, we must not say more. The statement appears to be wholly in accordance with the teaching of the Prayer Book, both in what it says, and in what it omits: and it is difficult to see what objection to it can be raised, explicitly based as it is on Holy Scripture.

(*e*) The Old Catholics have Orders whose validity is not disputed by anyone. If they were united with us, their bishops would take part in the consecration of our bishops, and in the end our Orders also would be outside the area of controversy.

We have not, of course, the smallest shadow of doubt about the validity of our own Orders; nor do we imagine that the full recognition by Rome of the validity of our Orders (there is no other body of Christians which denies it), would bring reunion with Rome appreciably nearer: for the profound doctrinal differences would remain.

But the reason why we should welcome the removal of the question of the validity of Anglican Orders from the area of controversy is this: that a title which is disputed, no matter by whom, or how unjustly, is a source of weakness. The Lambeth Conference of 1920 believed that the visible unity of the Church involved a ministry acknowledged by every

part of the Church. (Appeal to all Christian People, Section VI.) But Dr. Heiler, a friendly Lutheran critic, commenting on the Anglican claim (at Lausanne) to be a " bridge-church," says that this bridge does not connect with either end ; that the Anglican Communion is not sufficiently Catholic, because the Anglican ministry is not universally recognized as equivalent to other Catholic ministries ; and not sufficiently Protestant, because Anglican Protestantism is not dynamic and prophetic, but static and institutional. (Internationale Kirchlichle Zeitschrift, Jan., 1928, pp. 6 and 16, trans. in " Theology," No. 95, p. 282.) The former reproach, at any rate, would be rolled away by union with the Old Catholics. Those whom we invite to accept episcopacy, as necessary to the United Church of the future, can at present reply, " But *your* episcopacy is a purely Anglican product, which is not accepted as genuine by all Catholics." We must in future offer episcopacy, not merely as an indispensable part of the Anglican system of church government, but as necessary to the security of the sacramental experience which the Anglican Communion shares with all the other ancient churches. We cannot do this effectively unless our Orders are recognized, not merely by ourselves, or by our friends, but by all Catholics everywhere, as equally valid with other Catholic Orders. There is no way of bringing this about in the immediate future, except reunion with the Old Catholics : the result of which would be, that the whole wearisome argument about Anglican Orders, from the Nag's Head Fable to the Bull *Apostolicæ Curæ*, would cease to have any practical importance, and could be relegated to the antiquarians : a consequence for which the students in our theological colleges, at any rate, would be very thankful !

It may be asked, " Have the Old Catholic Churches any future ? If the movement which they represent is decaying, is it the time to ally ourselves with it ? "

It is difficult to judge of the real condition of churches in foreign countries, but, as far as my information goes, the Old Catholic Churches are not decaying. Forty years ago there were five Old Catholic bishops : now there are thirteen, and two more are to be consecrated shortly. On July 7th, 1929, I was present at the festival of the Old Catholic Young People's Society at St. Mary's, Utrecht. The church was crowded

to the doors with adolescents of both sexes from the three Utrecht parishes, and a large number made their Communion. At the Congress of 1928 we saw a large number of boys and girls from Germany, who held simultaneously a Young People's Congress, and marched through the streets of Utrecht carrying banners. A priest in Czechoslovakia writes to me that he has just finished building the third church in his parish. Bishop Küry, of Berne, in his annual report, says that there is not at the moment any want of candidates for Holy Orders (they all have to know Greek and Hebrew), and that though many Roman Catholic priests have applied to him for admission, he has not felt able to accept any of them. All this does not look like decay. It seems that the Old Catholics, while not advancing very rapidly, are certainly not declining.

(3) *How can Reunion be brought about?*

The method proposed by the Old Catholics themselves is as follows. Let a conference of Anglican and Old Catholic theologians, with or without representatives of the Orthodox Eastern Churches, be called together by the Archbishop of Canterbury. The Archbishop of Utrecht himself has suggested such a conference quite lately. A similar proposal was made by the Metropolitan Germanos, Exarch of the Patriarch of Constantinople, at the luncheon which was given by the Society of St. Willibrord in honour of Mgr. Van Vlijmen, Old Catholic Bishop of Haarlem, in December, 1928, on the occasion of his visit to England as the official representative of the ancient Church of Holland at the enthronement of the present Archbishop of Canterbury.

The basis of the discussion at this conference should be the Declaration of Utrecht. There is no question of "imposing" this formula upon the Anglican churches. It is merely the Old Catholic basis of negotiation: just as the Appeal to All Christian People was put forward in 1920 as our basis for negotiation.

If this conference of theologians were agreed, their conclusions should then be submitted to the Lambeth Conference. If accepted by the Lambeth Conference they might then be laid before the Old Catholic Bishops' Conference, which will meet in 1931. In any case, they must be brought before the Synods of all the various churches, both

Anglican and Old Catholic. If they were generally accepted, there seems no reason why full reunion should not immediately follow. In any further proposals for union with other bodies, the consent of the whole united Communion, Anglican and Old Catholic, would, of course, be necessary.

The conference of theologians would also have to consider :

(*a*) The relation between this proposal and the South India scheme, which has not yet reached its final form ;

(*b*) The relation between this proposal and any proposed negotiations between the Old Catholic and the Orthodox Eastern Churches :

(*c*) The difference between the Anglican Churches and the Old Catholic Church of Holland as to Communion in only one kind ;

(*d*) The difference between the Anglican and Old Catholic Churches as to the degrees of kindred and affinity within which marriage is prohibited.

This last point is referred to in the Lambeth Resolutions of 1888 ; it appears that the Old Catholics have not changed the rules of modern Roman Canon Law, whereas the Anglican Churches, following primitive example, based their rules on Holy Scripture (Leviticus xviii). But, since the marriage laws of the English and American Churches are not identical, divergence on these points need not necessarily prevent intercommunion. But it is necessary, in order to avoid misunderstanding, to make clear that no one can be admitted to Communion in any Church who has contracted a marriage not permitted in that Church, even though it may be permitted in his own Church.

I submit this memorandum, with all due respect, to those who have authority to decide this important matter : and I earnestly beg them to consider how small are the obstacles to this proposal, and how great are its advantages. Its adoption and execution would bring about actual reunion very soon between two sections of the Church of Christ which have been out of communion for over three centuries, the Church of Erasmus and the Church of More and Colet. The accomplishment of union in this case would show the world that reunion is a practical proposition, not merely an ideal or an aspiration : and would undoubtedly be a great encouragement to further efforts in other directions.

The Declaration of the Church of Utrecht.

The following is a translation of the Profession of Faith, or Declaration, of the Church of Utrecht, formulated by the Old Catholic Bishops assembled at Utrecht, September 24th, 1889 :—

1. We adhere faithfully to the Rule of Faith laid down by St. Vincent of Lerins in these terms :—" Id teneamus, quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est ; hoc est etenim vere proprieque catholicum." For this reason we persevere in professing the faith of the primitive Church, as formulated in the œcumenical symbols and specified precisely by the unanimously accepted decisions of the Œcumenical Councils held in the undivided Church of the first thousand years.

2. We therefore reject the decrees of the so-called Council of the Vatican, which were promulgated July 18th, 1870, concerning the infallibility and the universal Episcopate of the Bishop of Rome—decrees which are in contradiction with the faith of the ancient Church, and which destroy its ancient canonical constitution by attributing to the Pope the plenitude of ecclesiastical powers over all Dioceses and over all the faithful. By denial of his primatial jurisdiction we do not wish to deny the historic primacy which several Œcumenical Councils and the Fathers of the ancient Church have attributed to the Bishop of Rome by recognising him as the *Primus inter pares*.

3. We also reject the dogma of the Immaculate Conception promulgated by Pius IX. in 1854 in defiance of the Holy Scriptures and in contradiction to the tradition of the first centuries.

4. As for other Encyclicals published by the Bishops of Rome in recent times—for example, the Bulls *Unigenitus* and *Auctorem fidei*, and the Syllabus of 1864—we reject them on all such points as are in contradiction with the doctrine of the primitive Church, and we do not recognise them as binding

on the consciences of the faithful. We also renew the ancient protests of the Catholic Church of Holland against the errors of the Roman Curia, and against its attacks upon the rights of national Churches.

5. We refuse to accept the decrees of the Council of Trent in matters of discipline, and as for the dogmatic decisions of that Council we accept them only so far as they are in harmony with the teaching of the primitive Church.

6. Considering that the Holy Eucharist has always been the true central point of Catholic worship, we consider it our duty to declare that we maintain with perfect fidelity the ancient Catholic doctrine concerning the Sacrament of the Altar, by believing that we receive the Body and the Blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ under the species of bread and wine. The Eucharistic celebration in the Church is neither a continual repetition nor a renewal of the expiatory sacrifice which Jesus offered once for all upon the Cross ; but it is a sacrifice because it is the perpetual commemoration of the sacrifice offered upon the Cross, and it is the act by which we represent upon earth and appropriate to ourselves the one offering which Jesus Christ makes in Heaven, according to the Epistle to the Hebrews ix. 11, 12, for the salvation of redeemed humanity, by appearing for us in the presence of God (Heb. ix. 24). The character of the Holy Eucharist being thus understood, it is, at the same time, a sacrificial feast, by means of which the faithful, in receiving the Body and Blood of our Saviour, enter into communion with one another (1 Cor. i. 17).

7. We hope that Catholic theologians, in maintaining the faith of the undivided Church, will succeed in establishing an agreement upon questions which have been controverted ever since the divisions which have arisen between the Churches. We exhort the priests under our jurisdiction to teach, both by preaching and by the instruction of the young, especially the essential Christian truths professed by all the Christian confessions, to avoid, in discussing controverted doctrines, any violation of truth or charity, and in word and deed to set an example to the members of our churches in accordance with the spirit of Jesus Christ our Saviour.

8. By maintaining and professing faithfully the doctrine of Jesus Christ, by refusing to admit those errors which by the fault of men have crept into the Catholic Church, by laying aside the abuses in ecclesiastical matters, together with the worldly tendencies of the hierarchy, we believe that we shall be able to combat efficaciously the great evils of our day, which are unbelief and indifference in matters of religion.

Appendix 14

A DIGEST OF THE VIEWS EXPRESSED BY THE EVANGELICALS INVITED TO ATTEND THE ARCHBISHOPS' COMMITTEE ON FAITH AND ORDER ON THE 19TH NOVEMBER, 1929.

LAUSANNE REPORTS.

We regard the Reports accepted by the various sections as providing a good working basis for further attempts at reunion.

We are thankful that the representatives both of the Eastern Churches and the Free Churches should have agreed to adopt so many of the accepted standards of the Church of England ; and especially so when it is remembered that the non-Anglican Churches represented number some forty million communicants to less than five millions of the Anglican Church.

We heartily endorse the Reports of Sections I and II ; in Section III, whilst we prefer the definition of the visible Church of Christ given in our 19th Article, and the limitation of the Sacraments to the " Sacraments of the Gospel," we welcome as an accepted basis for reunion the six historical characteristics of " the Church on earth " as given. We also welcome in Section V. the agreement reached in the " five propositions."

We fully endorse the " concluding statement " drafted by the Chairman.

The statements of Archbishop Germanos at Lausanne show that further steps to reunion with the Protestant Churches on the basis of these Reports would not impede ultimate reunion with the Orthodox Church.

SOUTH INDIA PROPOSALS.

(*a*) We are convinced that the South India proposals are the outcome of a movement in which the work of the Spirit of God is manifest, and reflect a deep and universal desire for unity upon the part of the Indian Christians, and that upon the part of the Joint Committee the desire to further the evangelisation of India has been a governing motive.

It is of the first importance that in considering it we should constantly remember its Indian character ; and that we should not view it from any lower spiritual level than that in which it had its origin.

(*b*) The scheme appears to be the natural sequence to the " Appeal to all Christian people " put out by the Lambeth Conference of 1920.

In particular it accepts the four points of the Lambeth pronouncement of 1888, reaffirmed in 1920, neither adding to nor detracting from them.

In our opinion it would be unwise, if not actually inconsistent, for the Anglican Church to appear to go back upon previous Lambeth Conferences by pressing now for a fresh definition of the " historic episcopate." Unwise insistence upon definitions has been a frequent cause of schism.

The value of Episcopacy, like that of other institutions, does not depend upon consent to any particular definitions, for men may agree to value what they cannot agree to define. It is so in the present case, and we would urge those who value Episcopacy most highly to seek not to hinder its acceptance in South India.

We also note, with thankfulness, that there is nothing in the proposals which makes future reunion with the older Christian Churches more difficult.

(*c*) The Bishops of the Church in India have unanimously approved the main principle underlying the scheme, namely, the ultimate general acceptance of Episcopacy, together with an interim period during which the non-Episcopal Ministries of the uniting Churches shall be recognised. The Anglican representatives accept this as involving, during the interim period, the participation in the Lord's Supper when administered in Anglican Churches of the full members of the uniting Churches, though not confirmed, and permission to members of the Anglican Church to receive the Lord's Supper when administered in non-Episcopal Churches where they so desire.

In our opinion this action of the authorities of the Church of India is in entire accord with the history and best traditions of the Church of England. It corresponds both in practice and principle with the action of the Church in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in regard to the Church

of Scotland, the Continental Churches, and the Puritans; as is shown in the recently published work of Archdeacon Hunkin, "Episcopal Ordination and Confirmation in Relation to Intercommunion and Reunion."

It is worth remembering that many of the first ordained missionaries of the S.P.C.K. and S.P.G. had Lutheran orders only, and that it was thus that the Anglican Church in India had its beginning.

(*d*) We recognise the wisdom of the Joint Committee in leaving open for the present certain matters which are important, but which are not involved in the acceptance of the Lambeth basis of reunion. We rejoice that the Church in India is a living Church, and that the uniting bodies are seeking to follow the living voice of the Holy Spirit in regard to the new life and experience of the United Church.

We are sure that such a trust in the guidance of the Spirit is more acceptable to God than an excessive human prudence which would settle beforehand every detail of organisation and provide for every hypothetical danger.

The situation has arisen that was foreseen in Lambeth in 1920: "When men set their faces steadily towards the ideal of our Appeal, and especially when negotiations for organic reunion are in progress, or, again, when a scheme of reunion has in any place been adopted, situations will arise in which we should all agree that new lines of action may be followed."—(Report of the Lambeth Conference, 1920, p. 141.)

We believe that if we honour God at this time by heeding the call to advance, His Spirit will, in answer to our prayers, be given to guide the United Church so that the new lines of action shall be in accordance with His Will.

Apostolical Succession.

We accept heartily all that is stated in the 39 Articles as to the Ministry of the Church of Christ. We regard the Ordinal, and particularly the Preface to it, as laying down regulations intended only for the internal administration of the Church of England.

From the Reformation to the Restoration the leading divines of our Church regarded the Presbyterian orders of the Scotch and Continental Churches as equally valid with

their own, though the abandonment of Episcopacy was regretted and regarded as not required by Holy Scripture.

Bishop Burnet's History, I, p. 183, says that before the Act of Uniformity, "those who came to England from the foreign Churches had not been required to be ordained among us." Archdeacon Hunkin ("Episcopal Ordination and Confirmation in Relation to Intercommunion and Reunion") gives ample evidence that the Sacraments and Ministry of the Presbyterian Churches were recognised as truly Apostolic in their own branches of the Church by practically all the Anglican Bishops of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the only difference of opinion being as to what the order of the Church of England required for its own ministry.

The phrase "Apostolical Succession" is not found in our formularies. We admit and value the historical fact of the succession of our ministry and ordination from the times of the Apostles, a succession shared by the Presbyterian Churches. We do not believe that any validity of Sacraments or ministerial grace attaches to Episcopal ordination which is not shared by them. We regard the Grace of God as His direct gift, and not as mechanically transmitted or transmissible.

As to the "publick authority" referred to in Article 23, it is noteworthy that similar phrases are found in the Continental Confessions, which strongly favours an interpretation applicable to all alike.

FURTHER STEPS TOWARDS REUNION.

We should heartily welcome an approach being made to the Church of Scotland, or other ordered Protestant Churches.

The most hopeful line of approach to the Eastern Churches at present is by endeavours to secure their co-operation in Evangelistic work and in common spiritual education. In the "principles" adopted by the Arabic Branch of the Anglican Church in Egypt, which were approved by Bishop Gore, such co-operation with other Churches "Coptic, Orthodox, Presbyterian or otherwise," is advocated; and quite recently the Egypt Inter-Mission Council has been opened to representatives of the Coptic Church. As the Eastern Churches grow in spiritual enlightenment and

evangelistic zeal, the possibility of reunion will be brought nearer.

We are deeply convinced that all approaches to other Churches must be in the spirit of deep humility, for humility has always led to unity, as pride has led to schism.

(Signed) H. W. HINDE (*Convener*).
E. G. BOWRING.
Except the last paragraph on Lausanne Reports.
G. H. HARRIS.
G. T. MANLEY.
THOS. J. PULVERTAFT.

D11535
5-13

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
W. H. SMITH & SON, LTD.,
THE ARDEN PRESS, STAMFORD
STREET, LONDON, S.E.1

6
W75
1927
Church of England. Archbishops' committee to consider the findings o
of the Lausanne confer-

BX
6
W75
1927
10729

GRADUATE THEOLOGICAL UNION LIBRARY
BERKELEY, CA 94709

GTU Library
3 2400 00782 3440